DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 432 841 EA 029 997

AUTHOR	Karlsson, Jenny; Pampallis, John; Sithole, Sibusiso
TITLE	Restructuring Educational Governance at Sub-National Levels in South Africa. EPU Research Paper.
INSTITUTION	Natal Univ., Durban (South Africa). Education Policy Unit.
ISBN	ISBN-1-86840-185-5
PUB DATE	1996-01-00
NOTE	110p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Decentralization; Educational Administration; *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; *Government Role; *Government School Relationship; *Local Government; School Restructuring
IDENTIFIERS	*South Africa

ABSTRACT

This report covers two interrelated research projects, both dealing with questions of decentralization in the governance of education in South Africa. The first subproject examines the restructuring of educational governance at the level of provincial departments. Research at the institutional level forms part of the other subproject, which investigates governance in the well-endowed, formerly all-white schools now known as Model C schools. Data for the study were obtained from various sources, including a survey of international theoretical literature and policy statements in South Africa, and interviews with representative of major stakeholders, role players, and representatives of the different constituencies in Model C schools. The findings show that elements of both centralization and decentralization will be present in South Africa's new education system. Although the results suggest that greater school autonomy can lead to more innovative teaching, this is not an inevitable result. To distribute resources and governance in an equitable manner, a level of governance between the provincial and school levels is necessary. This would improve communication and contact between the province and the schools and among the schools themselves. The report concludes by stressing the importance of transitional mechanisms as school governance moves toward greater democratic participation. (Contains 55 references.) (RJM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 432 841

RESTRUCTURING EDUCATIONAL GOVERNANCE AT SUB-NATIONAL LEVELS IN SOUTH AFRICA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. Karlsson
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
2B

Jenny Karlsson
John Pampallis
Sibusiso Sithole

EPU Research Paper
January 1996

Education Policy Unit
University of Natal
Durban

EA 029 997

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Published by the Education Policy Unit
University of Natal
Private Bag X10
Dalbridge 4014
South Africa
Tel: (031) 260-2607
Fax: (031) 260-2118

Copyright ©1996: Education Policy Unit

ISBN: **1-86840-185-5**

CONTENTS

PAGE

List of Abbreviations 1

Preface 2

Executive Summary 3

1. Introduction 9
   - 1.1 Need which led to the research 9
   - 1.2 Significance of the research 11
   - 1.3 Aims of the research 12
   - 1.4 Scope of the investigation 14

2. Methodology 16
   - 2.1 Review of international literature 16
   - 2.2 Review of stakeholder and role player policy statements 17
   - 2.3 Focused interviews 18
   - 2.4 National conference 20
   - 2.5 Population and sample of Model C schools 20

3. Literature reviews 27
   - 3.1 International literature 27
   - 3.2 Policy statements of national stakeholders and role-players 30
   - 3.3 Review of conference papers and proceedings 43

4. Findings of the interview data 47
   - 4.1 Stakeholder interviews 47
   - 4.2 Interviews at Model C schools 67

5. Conclusions 94

6. List of works cited 103

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ANC:	African National Congress
APEK:	Association of Professional Educators in KwaZulu-Natal
CA:	Constitutional Assembly
CBO:	Community Based Organisation
CEM:	Council of Education Ministers
COSAS:	Congress of South African Students
DEC:	Department of Education and Culture
DET:	Department of Education and Training
DNE:	Department of National Education
DoE:	Department of Education
DP:	Democratic Party
EPU:	Education Policy Unit
ERIC:	Educational Resources Information Centre
ERS:	Education Renewal Strategy
GNU:	Government of National Unity
HEDCOM:	Heads of Education Departments Committee
HOA:	House of Assembly
HOD:	House of Delegates
HOR:	House of Representatives
IFP:	Inkatha Freedom Party
IPET:	Implementation Plan for Education and Training
ISAP:	Index to South African Periodicals
KDEC:	KwaZulu Department of Education and Culture
KZNWG:	KwaZulu-Natal Working Group on Education
NAPTOSA:	National Professional Teachers Organisation of South Africa
NECC:	National Education Coordinating Committee
NEPI:	National Education Policy Investigation
NGO:	Non-government Organisation
NP:	National Party
NTS:	Natal Teachers Society
PTA:	Parent-Teacher Association
PTSA:	Parent-Teacher-Student Association
RIEP:	Research Institute for Educational Planning
SABINET:	South African Bibliographic and Information Network
SACD:	South African Co-operative Database
SADTU:	South African Democratic Teachers Union
SAFSAS:	South African Federation of State Aided Schools
SAIRR:	South African Institute of Race Relations
SONAT:	Society of Natal Teachers
SRC:	Students Representative Council

PREFACE

This research project was conceived and started soon after the 1994 election. Since then the national government's policy development process has impacted on the issues covered in this research and has to some extent pre-empted this report. These developments are, in fact, partially responsible for the delay in the production of this report since the authors participated in some of the policy formulation processes and helped to influence the direction of the policy which has emerged and, in some cases, even been adopted by the national government. So in a sense, the research has fed into the policy development process even before the publication of this report.

As a result, most (but not all) of the conclusions of this project are consistent with the emerging policies. But over and above these conclusions, the report gives important insights into the thinking of the different political and educational organisations which have influenced and continue to influence the outcomes of the policy development process as well as aiding an understanding of the interplay of the different forces. It also gives insights into the views and experiences of important actors within Model C schools, the only group of South African schools which has had the experience of exercising considerable governance powers and with whom the government must still negotiate in line with Section 247 of the constitution. These views and experiences, of course, have relevance for the extension of governance powers to other schools in the system.

It is hoped that this report will prove useful to policy makers in the structures of state, activists in educational organisations and academics alike.

John Pampallis
Director
Education Policy Unit
University of Natal

6

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose of the research

Soon after its unbanning in 1990, the ANC and allied organisations began to give serious attention to the development of education policies for a democratic South Africa. However, up until the adoption of the Interim Constitution at the end of December 1993, the ANC, destined to become the major component of the Government of National Unity (GNU) after the April 1994 elections, had given little serious consideration to the question of educational governance at levels between the national and the institutional levels. The granting of concurrent powers over education (except for universities and technikons) to the provincial and national governments, was not anticipated by those who were developing the education policies of the ANC and its allies; they had expected a far more centrally controlled system. It was thus imperative for the ANC to adapt its policies and to develop new ones consistent with the new constitutional framework, within the context of the give and take of GNU politics. A central aim of this research was to contribute to this process.

One sub-national level of governance in which the ANC and its allies, especially the National Education Co-ordinating Committee (NECC), had developed policy for educational governance in the pre-election period, was the school level. In particular, they were interested in developing policy for the operation of Parent-Teacher-Student Associations (PTSAs) in secondary schools and Parent-Teacher Associations (PTAs) in primary schools. From its founding in 1986, the NECC demanded that the establishment of such school governance structures, which were aimed at empowering local school communities, should become part of state policy.

In the early 1990s, the NECC's demand for strengthening the power of local communities, gained resonance from a completely different section of society. Most of the state schools for whites were more or less coerced into becoming state-aided (Model C) schools; their state subsidies were reduced and their governing bodies, made up of elected representatives of the parents, were given substantial powers over school governance, including the right to charge compulsory school fees. In this way, these privileged schools managed to maintain and in some cases improve their facilities and resources.

Model C was an experiment in the decentralisation of power to the institutional level, applied widely through a significant segment of the school system and carried out with the support of the state, in contrast to the hostility the state displayed towards the PTSAs. Thus we decided, as a part of the study of the sub-national governance, to focus on Model C as an example of the decentralisation of power to the school level, from whose experiences, both positive and negative, lessons could be learned.

Data collection

Data for the study was obtained from various sources. These include a survey of international theoretical literature, published separately (Karlsson, 1995) but summarised in this report, as well as a review of policy statements of various policy actors in South Africa, interviews with representatives of major (national and provincial) stakeholders and role players as well as representatives of the different constituencies in Model C schools. In addition, the Natal EPU, together with the Wits EPU and the national Department of Education, co-hosted a major national conference, 'Towards a New Framework for School Organisation', which was also an important source of data for this study. The proceedings of the conference have been published separately (Greenstein et al, 1995).

International experience

The literature examined includes a survey of the experiences of a number of different countries in Africa, Asia, Latin America and Europe. The most salient features of the literature survey were that:

- There is no global trend towards decentralisation or centralisation alone;
- Education systems usually have features of both decentralisation and centralisation simultaneously;
- Neither centralised nor decentralised governance systems are guaranteed to reduce inequality and extend democracy, efficiency or quality. These goals can be achieved or eroded in either a predominantly centralised or a predominantly decentralised system;
- Education systems, despite public proclamations that they serve the long term educational needs of the people, are primarily designed to meet the political interests of the government of the day;
- Changes in the system of school governance need to be planned so that learners, parents, the community, school personnel and administrators are prepared and understand their roles, the objectives, powers and functions of governance structures and the outcomes that are anticipated. In particular, provision must be made to ensure that these role-players can acquire the necessary knowlege and skills to perform their functions properly.

Stakeholder positions

Stakeholders interviewed included three political parties:- the ANC, the National Party (NP) and the Democratic Party (DP), two teacher organisations:- the South African Democratic Teachers Union (SADTU) and the Natal Teachers Society (NTS), a National Professional Teachers Organisation of South Africa (NAPTOSA) affiliate, a major provincial bureaucratic initiative:- the KwaZulu-Natal Working Group, (KZNW.G) and the NECC. In addition the policy documents or policy statements of these organisations as well as those of the Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP) and the GNU were reviewed. Most of these stakeholders as well as some others, such as provincial governments and students organisations, attended the conference and elaborated on their positions there.

The positions on educational governance expressed by the different stakeholders showed a fairly high degree of convergence although there were significant differences in nuance and emphasis. The convergence which has taken place over the past five years is no doubt due to the overall political atmosphere in South Africa, resulting from the negotiations for transition to democratic goverment and the establishment of the GNU.

All the stakeholders agreed that some level of decentralisation of power in education is necessary and that powers ought to be assigned to different levels of the education system. All agreed that governance structures (as opposed to merely administrative structures), with participation from civil society, ought to exist at the national, provincial, and school levels. All except the NP felt that some governance structures should exist at the local/district/circuit level, while the position of the IFP was unclear. The IFP supported the establishment of administrative structures at a level between the province and the school, but it is not clear to what extent they believed there should be non-state stakeholder participation at this level. The NP's position possibly stems from a desire to leave as much autonomy as possible for the school communities, which are more racially and culturally homogeneous than districts would be. The support for district-level governance structures by the ANC and its allied organisations (SADTU and NECC) was, in fact, precisely because they saw this as a mechanism for more effectively deracialising schools and distributing resources more equitably.

The main differences between the ANC-alliance and the other stakeholders on the overall governance system was one of emphasis. The former wanted strong central powers which could be used to ensure greater equity in resource distribution, while powers would be delegated to lower levels for purposes of democratic participation and efficiency. The latter organisations placed more emphasis on a need to devolve powers to lower levels where they felt that users of the education system would have greater control. Such differences in emphasis can be very important, as is attested to by the referral of the National Education Policy Bill to the Consititutional Court by the minority parties in parliament in December 1995. While all parties were happy to have the national government determine norms and standards in education, the smaller parties differed strongly with the ANC majority on what these norms and standards should be.

All stakeholders agreed that schools should have governing bodies with representatives of parents, teachers, students (in secondary schools), and the community[1], and most of them tended to support the idea that the governing bodies should have greater or lesser managerial powers as well as governance (ie. policy making) powers. The notable exception, perhaps predictably, was the KZNWG, representing the bureaucracy, which wanted to restrict even the governance powers and make the govening bodies purely advisory, thus keeping power in the hands of appointed officials.

All the stakeholders accepted that Model C schools were elitist (since they were well resourced and could charge compulsory fees), although they did not necessarily all see this as a bad thing. They all said that racial discrimination, while occuring sometimes in a covert or disguised manner, was not acceptable. However, the idea that parents should be able to pay in order to get better facililties for their children in a public school was acceptable to, for example, the NP. The DP believed that some form of elitist schooling was inevitable. It also pointed out that the present Model C schools had been elitist while they were still ordinary government schools. The ANC, SADTU and the NECC saw the need for the government to review all schools, including Model C and private schools, with a view to rationalising them in order to create greater equity in the school system. Subsequent to the interviews, the government did in fact do just this, through the Hunter Committee (DOE, 1995 b) and the draft White Paper on the Organisation, Governance and Funding of Schools (DOE, 1995) which both recommended that in future only two legal categories of schools should exist: public and independent. A final White Paper on these matters was pending at the time of publication.

---

[1] The IFP is not included in this. They were not interviewed and their statements have not touched on the matter. However, in an interview with a member of the research team on another matter (on 15 May 1995), the KwaZulu-Natal IFP Minister of Education and Culture, Dr V Zulu, indicated that he was opposed to both teacher and student representation on school governing bodies.

The general perception among stakeholders was that the introduction of Model C had resulted in a shift in power towards the parents and away from the Department of Education and that the latter now played the role of consultants, providing guidance and assistance to the schools rather than the supervisory role they had previously played. Despite this shift, it was accepted by all that governing bodies did not always have the skills or knowledge to fulfill their tasks properly; it was thus necessary to provide training for governing body members.

As far as the future of Model C schools was concerned, the NP felt that they, or something similar, should continue to exist. The DP felt that there should be an expansion of the state-aided sector in order, *inter alia*, to help mobilise non-state resources for education. The ANC and its allies, as indicated above, wanted the whole system of schooling rationalised in order to eliminate privileged sectors. At the same time, the ANC stressed that the quality of education offered by the Model C schools should not be allowed to deteriorate as this could lead to a flood of students to private schools.

Data from Model C schools

In the Model C schools themselves, principals, governing body members and teachers from a sample of schools were interviewed. In general, they displayed a consciousness of the privileged position of their schools and a concern that that position, and the relatively high quality of education that was perceived to go with it, was under threat from a new government committed to greater social equity. While for some this was cause for despondency, others were both trying to anticipate likely future government actions and developing alternative strategies for their schools. Some were trying to adapt to the new circumstances and transform their schools in line with more open and non-racial norms. For example some had formulated admission policies aimed at deracialising student intake, had started to give bursaries to 'deserving' black students and were making plans to share resources with more needy schools.

In most interviews it was argued that Model C schools were unavoidably elitist. Interviewees argued that Model C schools were becoming increasingly less affordable and less accessible to the majority of both black and white students. Whereas large numbers of black students may be excluded from Model C, this is not necessarily because of racism (although it could be in some cases) but because class and not race is in the process of becoming the main determinant of access to priveleged schooling.

In the interviews, the researchers sought evidence as to whether the introduction of Model C was considered to have benefited the quality of education at the schools and made them more responsive to community needs, especially those of parents who they were supposed to have empowered. The interviewees were asked, *inter alia*, questions about the powers of governing bodies, their representivity, their accountability, parental participation in decision making and in school affairs, admissions policies and curriculum innovation.

Despite the formal shift of power from the education departments to parents, the evidence tended to show that the actual power of most parents, while increasing somewhat, could not really be considered to be markedly greater than before. In general, principals continued to exercise a great deal of power over their schools. In some cases the governing bodies hardly functioned and in others were considered to be little more than support for the efforts of the principals. In other cases, though, the governing bodies,in particular the chairpersons, appeared to use fully the powers given to them by the law. As a result they exercised considerable power, much more than in the pre-Model C days. However, this did not necessarily translate into power for the parent body. There were various reasons for this.

Those elected to governing bodies tended to be professional or business people who were elected because of their managerial expertise and were not always representative of the socio-economic profile of the parent body as a whole. Also, many parents appeared to be apathetic and did not take a keen interest in the affairs of the school. This may, at least partly, be related to a lack of information on the functions of the governing body. In addition, mechanisms for parental participation in decision-making were poorly developed or non-existent in most schools.

It has often been stated by proponents of Model C that these schools have led to greater curriculum innovation in schools. The evidence, however, is somewhat more ambiguous. The principals and school governors tended to indicate that there was some level of innovation at their schools while most teachers felt that there had been no innovative curricula changes since the schools became Model C. Although many Model C schools use flexible and student-centred teaching methodologies, several teachers pointed out that the Natal Education Department had offered an enabling and flexible environment which included opportunities for experimentation. At some schools though, it appears that the greater autonomy of Model C and the changed role of inspectors and superintendents who started to act as advisors rather than prescribers to teachers, had led to greater experimentation in curricula and teaching methodologies and to more effective teaching.

The findings thus seem to suggest that greater school autonomy can provide the opportunity for more innovative teaching, but does not necessarily have this result. It appears that if the principal and teachers at a school are well motivated and creative, they can take advantage of the decreased control to innovate, but this is not necessarily as a result of greater school autonomy.

Conclusions

The study concludes that it is inevitable that elements of both centralisation and decentralisation will be present in the new education system. There is no one best way to allocate powers to the different levels of the education system. The allocation should be determined in a flexible, negotiated process in such a way that core values and principles are promoted. In South Africa, these principles would include the promotion of a national identity and a nationally coherent education system; the encouragement of local initiatives; an equitable distribution of resources and their effective and efficient use; and the building of strong partnerships between the various levels of governance as well as between the state and different stakeholders.

The study also concludes that at least one level of governance is necessary between the provincial and school levels. Such a level would improve communication and contact between the province and the schools and among schools in the same district. It could support the sharing and/or redeployment of resources between schools within the same district, something which the province or individual schools would struggle to do effectively.

All school models need to be a rationalised so that the discriminatory distinctions between different types of schools cease to exist. All schools should have governing bodies composed of representatives of at least the parents, teachers and (at secondary schools) students. More power ought to be devolved to governing bodies of schools, with the exception of the schools that are currently Model C, which already have substantial power. The powers of the latter would need to be curtailed to some extent. For example, admissions policies should be determined by the provincial education departments and not by school governing bodies in order to make the distribution of students throughout the public school system more rational. Also the right to exclude students by other means, for example by charging compulsory fees to all students, should be excluded as a power of governing bodies. All governing bodies should be fully involved in the development of their schools and in ensuring that they become and remain effective educational institutions. Teachers should be employed by the provincial education departments and not by schools.

The provincial education departments and their local/district offices have an important role to play in supporting the schools through providing training programmes for members of governing bodies, providing them with information and advice and ensuring that the governing bodies function in an effective and accountable manner.

The report concludes by stressing the importance of transitional mechanisms as the system of school governance moves towards greater democratic participation and greater equity.

1. INTRODUCTION

As South Africa moves away from apartheid towards increasing levels of democracy, the education system, like most public institutions, is undergoing fundamental restructuring. The old system of numerous racially and ethnically-based education departments is being replaced by a single national ministry of education and nine non-racial provincial departments. Each provincial department is rationalising and incorporating the different apartheid departments which operated in its territory. It is at provincial level that the impact of restructuring will be felt most.

This report covers two inter-related research projects, both dealing with questions of decentralisation in the *governance* of education. The first sub-project examines the restructuring of educational governance at the level of provincial departments. This includes regional/district/circuit levels, as well as governance at school level. Research into the institutional level also forms part of the other sub-project, which investigates governance in what is perhaps the most controversial group of schools, the well-endowed, formerly all-white schools now known as Model C schools.

The relationship between decentralised education and governance is not always very clear. Many people wrongly believe that decentralisation applies only to administrative functions within the education system. However, decision-making structures at various levels of the schooling system may also be given decentralised powers and functions. In this report, policy-making and policy-direction bodies are referred to generically as governance structures. A schooling system can be designed to have such structures at various levels, from the highest, such as at national level in the case of a governing council, down to the lowest, such as the parent-teacher-student association (PTSA) or governing body in the neighbourhood school.

The nature of the governance structure, i.e. its status and composition and the degree of powers and functions given to it, reflect notions of social order and justice and the power relations of the society in which it is located. In a democratic society, it is envisaged that governing structures should be democratic, i.e. that they should embody democratic values and operate in democratic ways.

With the restructuring and democratising of the education system in South Africa, the governance structures of the schooling system have become a focus of attention. These structures have the potential to bring about greater social justice in the power relations of our schooling system by correcting the imbalances of the past and enabling all those involved in schools to participate freely in developing a culture of learning.

1.1 Need which led to the research

In 1994 the Education Policy Unit (EPU) at the University of Natal began to research centralisation and decentralisation of education at sub-national levels. This was undertaken because the 1993 multi-party negotiations led to the adoption of a new

South African Constitution and a system which gives national and provincial governments concurrent power over education (excluding university and technikon education). South Africa therefore has a system which is simultaneously centralised and decentralised. The provinces not only administer the school system, but also have substantial policy making powers. Although the central government sets national norms and standards, these are not precisely defined in the Constitution. These grey areas will undoubtedly be sorted out to some extent in practice, but some issues may end up being resolved in the constitutional court.

The multi-party negotiations and the Constitution reflect a political settlement which paid little attention to the implications that decentralisation would have on education. Among all the organisations in opposition to the NP government, only the ANC and its allies had initiated significant research in the area of education policy.[2] From these research initiatives it became evident that important policy positions were emerging. Although these positions emphasised the importance of community and stakeholder participation in education, they did not give adequate consideration to the eventuality that the political settlement would decentralise most of education as a proficiency of provincial governments. After South Africa's first democratic elections in 1994, a GNU was introduced, with the ANC as the dominant party in national government and in seven of the nine provinces. As a partner in the GNU, the ANC was compelled to uphold the Constitutional provisions and implement a provincially decentralised education and training system, while maintaining a system for university and technikon education in which autonomous educational institutions are responsible to the central government.

One sub-national level of governance in which the ANC and its allies - especially the NECC - did develop policy for educational governance, was the school level. In fact the NECC played an important role in establishing PTSAs in secondary schools and PTAs in primary schools in the late 1980s and early 1990s. From its establishment in 1986, the NECC demanded that the establishment of such school governance structures, which were aimed at empowering local school communities, should become part of state policy. Although several hundred PTSAs were established in schools around the country, they were seldom stable in their operation over long periods of time, and often only functioned as crisis committees. The reasons for this included hostility from the authorities, an unclear understanding of their functions and objectives and insufficient skills (e.g. organisational and accounting/financial skills) on the part of PTSA members.

In the early 1990s the NECC's demand for strengthening the power of local communities gained resonance from a completely different section of society. Most of the former state schools were more or less coerced into become state-aided (Model C) schools; their state subsidies were reduced and their governing bodies, made up of elected representatives of the parents, were given substantial powers over school governance, including the right to charge compulsory school fees. In the light of perceived threats to their privileges in the post-election period, white communities appeared to swing solidly in support of Model C. Despite its costs to parents, Model C appeared to be a way of maintaining school resources at levels to which these communities had become accustomed by maintaining the communities' control over the schools.

---

[2] In 1990 the National Education Coordinating Committee (NECC) initiated the National Education Policy Investigation (NEPI). In 1992/93 13 NEPI reports on policy options for a post-apartheid education system were published. Early in 1994, after a lengthy process of consultation among its members and alliance partners, the ANC published a Policy Framework for Education and Training. This was followed a few months later by more than 22 task group reports under the title Implementation Plan for Education and Training (IPET).

Model C was an experiment in the decentralisation of power to institutional level, carried out with the support of the state and applied widely through a significant segment of the school system. We thus decided, as part of this study of sub-national governance, to focus on it as an example of the decentralisation of power to the school level, from which both positive and negative lessons could be learned.

1.2 Significance of the research

This in-depth study should make an important contribution to the ongoing policy debate and to the restructuring process. The research was conducted in the post-settlement period of 1994/95 during which the initial steps were taken to transform a highly centralised, yet fragmented, racially-based and differentiated system into a democratic, non-racial and non-sexist system with both centralised and decentralised characteristics. Implementation of the new system was therefore not a simple constitutional *fait accompli*. Many questions remain about centralisation and decentralisation of education, the implications of these different approaches and the various ways in which they can be implemented. In addition, the 1993 Constitution is only an Interim Constitution to be superceded by a Constitution which will be adopted by the Constitutional Assembly (CA) after a lengthy and in-depth process of national consultation. The transient nature of the 1993 Constitution and the consultative process currently underway heighten the significance of this research.

Although this report is being written during the second year of the GNU, there is still a general lack of clarity over the type, nature and extent of decentralised governance at a sub-national level. In particular, the question of decentralised power to the local and institutional levels remains the subject of vigorous dispute. This is because these levels are important domains of hegemonic influence and power, critical to the democratisation of social processes. These issues are one of the focii of the Committee to Review School Organisation, Governance and Funding, which submitted its report to the national Minister of Education in late 1995. The government's response to that report is the subject of a White Paper which is due for release more or less concurrent with this report. The White Paper, however, will still leave questions unanswered and negotiations between the government and Model C schools over the latter's powers and functions will follow the publication of the White Paper.

The future of Model C schools is by far the most contentious area of the dispute over decentralised power. In 1992, the National Party government converted virtually all the former white schools into Model C schools. This turned the state schools into state-aided schools, decreasing their subsidy and thus forcing parents to pay much higher fees. In return, governing bodies elected by the parents were given ownership of the physical property of the schools and given control over some of the hiring and firing of staff, admissions policy, the setting of compulsory fees and raising of other funding for the schools. The future of Model C schools has clear implications for equity in the education system. The simple abolition of Model C schools may not be in the best interests of a democratic state, at least not in the short run, although it is clear that the GNU has to resolve the uncertainty over the future of this model. This report is significant in that it identifies the primary strengths and weaknesses of Model C, points to the issues which are disputed and makes recommendations for their resolution.

1.3 Aims of the research

The research had four aims:

i. to examine the theoretical issues of centralisation and decentralisation in the light of South African and international experiences;

ii. to identify and critically evaluate proposals for school governance in South Africa;

iii. to make proposals on a model of decentralisation within the context of the Reconstruction and Development Programme, the provisions of the Interim Constitution and existing conditions in South Africa;

iv. to evaluate an existing model of decentralised school governance (Model C schools) in relation to principles of non-racism, equality, quality, democracy, inclusiveness, etc.

Four research questions were pursued:

- What can South Africa learn from international experiences of centralisation and decentralisation?
- What model of decentralisation is favoured by various stakeholders?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of Model C schools?
- What should happen to Model C schools in a transformed democratic, non-racial and non-sexist schooling system?

The research questions were posed within the context of the following principles for transforming the governance of South Africa's schooling system:[3]

i. *Democracy*: The policy and practice in the schooling system should ensure the active participation in consultation and decision-making by representatives of those who have an interest, stake, or play a role in the schooling system. In particular, this includes teachers, parents, scholars, workers, employers and the broader community. It is, however, recognised that there is inherent tension between representative and participatory democracy; between democratically elected representatives who must take responsibility for decisions and actions and the democratic rights of the individual which are assured in the Constitution. Implementing democratic governance structures also has implications for transparency and accountability in that advice can only be given and decisions made if information from the departmental authorities is made available and lines of communication are operational.

---

[3] The outline of these principles is based on those given in the White Paper on Education and Training published by the Department of Education on 15 March 1995, pg 21-22.

The schooling system must also contribute to the realisation of democracy in the lives of citizens so that they may participate fully in all facets of the life of their communities and the nation at large.

ii. *Non-racism and non-sexism*: No person should be discriminated against and disadvantaged on the basis of race or gender. Each person and their diverse cultural and linguistic traditions should be respected. This will assist in the development of a national democratic culture which accepts and is tolerant of diversity.

iii. *Redress*: Past inequalities in the education system must be corrected, especially for those people who suffered particular disadvantages or who are vulnerable. This includes women, illiterate people and those who have been damaged by violence. The rehabilitation of schools must be included in strategies to implement redress. In addition, this principle underpins the equitable deployment of the state's resources in schools so that all people are given the opportunity to avail themselves of the same quality of education.

In usage, the terms *centralised* and *decentralised* are often unclear and ambiguous. For example, in Latin America *decentralisation* usually refers to the transfer of power from the federal state to provincial authorities but not necessarily to schools. In the United States this same term refers to the transference of power from local districts to schools. In other countries the term also includes the privatisation of individual schools. For the purposes of this study, it was accepted that decentralisation can occur in several ways:

- Firstly, tasks are allocated to different departments and divisions. This *deconcentrates* or *decongests* the workload at the centre. It is a top-down distribution of power and usually only involves administrative tasks. No real change in authority occurs and the system essentially remains centralised.

- Secondly, decision-making is *delegated* or lent to lower levels as a form of power-sharing. When a unitary framework is established by the central government, the delegation of power tends to be restricted. Furthermore, this form of decentralising power is not secure. It can be recalled at any time by the central authorities.

- The third form, the *devolution* of power, occurs when authority is extended to structures at lower levels, i.e. the institution. This is often done by means of a constitution or by statute and often gives provincial or local authorities control over finances, planning and the execution of programmes.

- *Privatisation* is a sub-form of devolution. Authority and ownership is given to institutions that are able to act independently.

There are two ways in which decentralisation can affect relationships. The first is between the different governance levels. This is described as being *external*. The second way in which decentralisation influences relationships is *internal*, among the stakeholders participating within a governance structure at one level. It affects the balance between interest groups and the power relations they represent.

1.4 Scope of the investigation

The research considered centralisation and decentralisation at all levels, i.e. national, provincial, district/regional/circuit and institutional levels, but only as they relate to governance of the schooling system. Thus the research was not concerned with centralised and decentralised administration unless these were relevant to governance issues.

The opinions and positions of national, provincial and institutional stakeholders were canvassed because their interest and involvement in schooling occurs at various levels of governance and their constituency could be affected by changes introduced as a result of the constitutional provisions.

In terms of the research questions, the research project was designed only to consider and evaluate the existing Model C schools, which were introduced and administered by the former departments of education of the whites-only House of Assembly (HOA). Model C schools were selected because their governing bodies were given devolved statutory powers as a result of legislation passed by the apartheid parliament during its last few years. This led to these schools being the subject of considerable national debate and controversy. It is widely believed that the former white minority government introduced Model C in order to retain the racial and cultural hegemony of these schools in the hands of white middle class communities, when it became obvious that education in South Africa would be de-racialised. It was also apparent that it would be impossible for Model C schools to remain unaffected by changes in the schooling system. This was confirmed in September 1994 when the Minister of Education, Prof Sibusiso Bengu announced that:

> *The ownership, governance and funding of schools which currently derive from the apartheid era, must be brought within a coherent, national, nonracial framework in which constitutional rights are fully upheld and which is acceptable in a democratic state. The inherited models of schools of whatever type must therefore be replaced. I shall shortly be making proposals ... for a review of these matters of ownership and governance ... on the basis of a set of broad principles which the draft policy document sets out. ... I shall be fulfilling a policy commitment of my party to*

> *undertake reviews of Model C schools, the farm school system and of the subsidy system applying to private and independent schools.*[4]

Early in 1995 Prof Bengu announced the establishment of a 'Review Committee' which would make recommendations on the financing, ownership and governance of all schools within South Africa.[5] This Committee's report (DoE, 1995b), sometimes referred to as the 'Hunter Report', was released in August 1995. Many of their recommendations have a direct bearing on this investigation's findings, and are referred to in the concluding section of this report.

---

[4] Hansard 1994 9:2778.

[5] Business Day, 1/03/95; Citizen, 1/03/95.

2. METHODOLOGY

The nature of the aims and research questions clearly indicated that there were no simple answers to the research questions. In view of the complexity of the issues it would be necessary to consider the questions from various perspectives and in the light of principles which might be at variance with each other.[6] The study was seeking to be descriptive and uncover nuances of meaning within the collected data which would be in the form of texts. This qualitative approach to the research topic necessitated the use of several research methods, i.e. a review of international literature, a review of policy statements, an analysis of transcriptions from focused interviews, and an analysis of conference papers and proceedings.

The researchers were also involved in other related research work running concurrently with this study. Although these activities were not part of this investigation, they helped to inform and contextualise it. The reports which resulted from these activities also allowed the research team to explore specific aspects of governance in far greater depth. The reports include:

- a review of the present state and future prospects of PTSAs;
- a case study of the breakdown of governance and learning at a high school in KwaZulu-Natal,
- a position paper on the role of students in governance structures.[7]

2.1 Review of international literature

The initial inquiry was limited to online databases available through the South African Bibliographic and Information Network (SABINET). These were the South African Co-operative Database (SACD), the Research Institute for Education Planning (RIEP) of the University of the Orange Free State and the Index to South African Periodicals (ISAP). Although these searches retrieved references, some were not suitable because of the scope of the study, which was limited to the schooling system and sub-national governance and also because the researcher was seeking international experiences of decentralisation.

An extensive search was then made of the Educational Resources Information Centre (ERIC) database. This search uncovered a vast number of references, most of which were available only in the United States (US). Attempts to acquire the most salient of these documents in the US were unsuccessful.

---

[6] The principle of redress is underpinned by both equality and development. These are in tension with each other while they are related. For example, in the South African context development implies forms of affirmative action, while the goal of redress is equitable social conditions.

[7] These reports are available from the Education Policy Unit at the University of Natal.

The most useful references were found in journals, both local and international, available in South African libraries.

2.2 Review of stakeholder and role player policy statements

The researchers needed to gain an understanding of the education policy positions of the major stakeholders and role players in South Africa and to ascertain their support for or against decentralised governance of schooling. It was therefore necessary to identify the major political stakeholders represented in the GNU, the main professional bodies, education administrators and the major national education formations within civil society organisations. The categories identified were:

- Government
- Provincial heads of education departments
- Teachers' organisations
- Political organisations and their allies in civil society

Organisations and institutions in these categories were contacted with a request for their policy documents or statements. These were usually in the form of a report, booklet or pamphlet. Unfortunately some of the organisations did not respond to our request or they appeared to be elusive and without reliable contact addresses.

Policy documents from the following organisations were critically examined:

Government

i. Former NP government
ii. GNU

Provincial heads of education departments

i. KZNWG

Teachers' organisations

i. NTS
ii. SADTU

Political organisations and their allies in civil society

i. ANC
ii. NECC
iii. IFP

2.3 Focused interviews

Two sets of focused interviews were conducted. For the purpose of these interviews a data collection instrument comprising two sets of open-ended questions was developed (see Appendix 1). The first set of questions was about sub-national governance structures, composition, powers and functions. The second set of questions was about Model C schools.

Both the first and second sets of questions were used in the stakeholder and role player interviews, but only the questions pertaining to Model C schools were put to the Model C school interviewees.

2.3.1 Stakeholders

It was decided to interview representatives of the organisations and groups whose policy documents were reviewed, in order to develop a deeper understanding of their positions. The data collected would supplement the documentary review of their policy statements. Thus, this set of focused interviews were used for two reasons:

i. to verify our intepretation of stakeholder and role player policy statements which were reviewed;

ii. to collect data on issues such as Model C schools, which were not covered in the stakeholder and role player policy statements.

Interviews were requested with particular individuals on the basis of their status within their organisation and their availability. The interviews were recorded and transcribed. The transcriptions comprise the texts which were then analysed.

The findings comprise an analysis of seven interviews with spokespersons or representatives of various political parties, professional bodies, a mass-based educational non-governmental organisation and a joint restructuring initiative by administrators of former provincial departments of education:

- ANC
- NP
- DP
- NTS
- SADTU
- NECC
- KwaZulu Natal Working Group on Education (KZNWG)[8]

---

[8] This was a group of officials from all the education departments operating in the former KwaZulu homeland and the province of Natal as well as a few co-opted or interested individuals. It was recognised that in future a single education department would be implemented in the region so they met to make proposals and explore ways in which this could be done. Three reports were subsequently published by the KZNWG, providing detailed plans for a future education department.

The IFP failed to respond to a request for an interview and the new national Department of Education (DoE) declined to be interviewed until after the publication of the final White Paper on Education and Training, by which time the interviews had been completed.

2.3.2 Model C schools

Model C schools are a discrete component of this investigation. Information gathered from the stakeholder interviews could reflect only an *outside* perspective on Model C while an *inside* perspective could be provided by those people involved in Model C schools. It was therefore decided to interview a range of representatives from Model C school stakeholders. The principal, a teacher and a representative of the governing body were interviewed at each school in order to identify if there were different perceptions of the issues. A sample of 6 schools out of a total of 204 schools were selected in the province of KwaZulu-Natal.[9] No student representatives were interviewed because at the time of the study students were not participants in governing bodies at Model C schools.

The reasons for this set of interviews were:

i. to inform the researchers of the various perspectives of stakeholders within Model C schools;

ii. to collect authoritative data from the subject of the investigation;

iii. to ensure that the data collected did not reflect the perspective of one constituency only.

All the interviews were held between October and December 1994 (see Appendix 2). It is possible that subsequently there may have been changes in the positions of the interviewees. In addition, two of the groups no longer exist.[10]

In general, the questions that were posed during each interview were:

- What is the stakeholder's policy regarding decentralisation of education?
- What influences led to this position being adopted?
- What governance is envisaged at provincial, district/regional/circuit and institutional level and why?

---

[9] In 1992 there were 1860 Model C schools throughout South Africa (Pampallis, 1995.)

[10] The Natal Teachers' Society (NTS) has merged with the Society of Natal Teachers (SONAT) to form a new organisation called the Association of Professional Educators in KwaZulu-Natal (APEK), and the National Education Co-ordinating Committee has closed down. In addition, the KwaZulu Natal Working Group on Education was not a formal organisation and has subsequently disbanded.

- What powers and functions should be located with governance structures at provincial, district/regional/circuit and institutional level?

- Which stakeholders should be represented on a school governance structure?

2.4 National Conference

The researchers participated in convening a national conference with the theme 'Developing a new framework for school organisation'.[11] This was an event during which data was being generated by the conference participants and recorded by the researchers. The conference provided structured and unstructured opportunities for collecting data from stakeholders who had not been part of the focused interviews or whose ideas are not documented elsewhere. The conference was used by the researchers to raise issues of decentralisation of schooling at a public forum and with the media and to test stakeholder receptivity to potential models of school ownership, funding and governance. At the conference the preliminary findings of stakeholder interviews were circulated to all participants. This was done in order to disseminate the data already gathered and tentatively ascertain if there was disagreement with the findings. The papers presented at the conference were also used to inform the recommendations made in this report.

2.5 Population and sample of Model C schools

Background to Model C

At the end of 1990 there were two types of schools for the use of white scholars: government schools and private schools. In 1991 the government of President F.W. De Klerk unilaterally introduced the Model A, B and C as options for government schools (Pampallis, 1993). In order to change a government school's status to one of these models, at least 80% of the parents had to vote in an election, with 72% of them voting in favour of the change.

What were these models and how did they differ?

- Model A signified a former state school which had been privatised and received a state subsidy which diminished over four years. By the beginning of 1992 only one school had voted to become a Model A school.

- Model B was a school which remained as a state school but which gave white parents power, amongst other things, to decide whether to admit children from other racial groups to their schools, albeit in a very limited manner. The Percentage of black students could not exceed 50% and enrolment was controlled through entrance tests and other exclusionary devices. By the beginning of 1992, 692 of the formerly white schools had voted to become Model B.

---

[11] The conference was jointly organised by the Education Policy Units at the Universities of Natal and the Witwatersrand and the national Department of Education. It also served the purpose of informing the Committee to Review the Organisation, Governance and Funding of Schools which was sitting at the time.

- Model C was a former state school which was converted into a state-aided school. A subsidy was received to cover 75% of the normal operating costs. By the beginning of 1992 only 51 schools had voted to convert to Model C.

At the beginning of 1992 Model D was introduced.

- Model D was a state school which was allowed to recruit an unlimited number of black students. Initially there were only six Model D schools, but by 1993 the number of Model D schools had risen to 17.

In early 1992, the National Party government declared that *all* white state schools (except Model D) would become Model C schools on 1 April 1992. Only a two-thirds majority vote from parents would enable schools to remain as status quo or Model B schools. The outcome was that 96% of white state schools became Model C schools. Although Model C schools only represent 8-9% of the national school enrolment (Manganyi, 1995:6), it is this racial origin and differential treatment of these schools which forms the basis for the serious concern being expressed by some stakeholders over the perpetuation of Model C (Greenstein et al, 1995).

The National Party government's changes in 1992 were introduced against a backdrop of many factors. Firstly, the escalation of the crisis in African schools remained unabated despite a large degree of normalisation in terms of political conditions, for example, the 1990 unbanning of organisations and the release of political detainees and prisoners. Secondly, the rate of increase of the white population was falling and inequities in resourcing schools had already begun to decrease. The overall enrolment of white pupils was dwindling to an all time low and many schools were either under utilised in terms of capacity or forced to close down and be used for purposes other than education. Thirdly, the NECC and its affiliates had decided to embark on a massive campaign to open all schools to all pupils in an attempt to force the government to address the crisis in black schools and to enter into *bona fide* negotiations to bring about genuine changes in the entire education system. This campaign proved to be embarrassing for President De Klerk, who had promoted himself as a reformer.

How does a Model C school differ from other school types?

A Model C school is a state-aided school of a special type in that it is managed and controlled by an autonomous governing body elected by parents only. The principal, in his/her capacity as an executive officer, is a member of the governing body as an accountable officer. The existing physical facilities (buildings and grounds) are transferred free of charge to the governing body through a deed of grant, subject to a clause that if buildings are used solely for purposes other than education, ownership should revert to the state. The school is given a state subsidy which covers full salaries for all staff members appointed within the prescribed norms. This amounts to approximately 75% of operating costs. In addition to these distinguishing features, the governing body has substantive and wide ranging powers:

- It has a juristic personality and can sue and be sued in its own name.
- It appoints, promotes and dismisses staff members subject to applicable labour laws.
- It determines the general thrust of the school policy.
- It decides on additional curriculum programmes as deemed desirable by the parents.
- It has autonomy in terms of setting financial policy and the management of the funds of the school, subject to an independent audit.
- It determines tuition fees and can sue defaulting parents, but cannot expel or deny children an opportunity to learn simply on account of non-payment of fees.
- It can generate its own funds and resources.
- It has the responsibility for maintenance of physical facilities as well as specific functions related to capital expenditure.
- It determines the school admission policies.

Model C schools were rejected by extra-parliamentary forces (Nzimande, 1992; NEPI, 1992:22-24; EP Herald, 13/03/1992) on the basis that they were unilaterally introduced by the apartheid government to entrench minority white privileges and gave parents power to restrict access to these schools in terms of the powers vested in the governing bodies. Ironically, many white parents (Daily Dispatch, 15/04/1992; Star, 31/08/1992, 28/11/1992; Citizen, 1/12/1992) and teachers' organisations (New Nation, 3/07/1992) also rejected the Model C schools as a 'raw deal' which was imposed without affording them viable alternatives.

A sample of six Model C schools were selected on the basis of data supplied by the former Natal Education Department (NED). Characteristics that were considered in the selection of the sample were:

Type of school: Primary/Secondary/Combined
Medium of instruction[12]: English/Afrikaans/English and Afrikaans
Enrolment: Above 500 pupils/Below 500 pupils
Gender: Single sex/Co-educational
Location: Metropolitan/Rural or Town

---

[12] Some primary schools included German as the medium of instruction.

Using these characteristics, the following table was compiled of the Model C schools within the former Natal province (NED, 1994).

	Schools	English	Eng/Afr	Afrikaans	Single Sex	Co-ed	Metro	Rural/ Town	<500 pupils	>500 pupils
Primary	143	86	14	43	4	139	73	70	110	33
Secondary	57	33	9	15	20	37	34	23	14	43
Combined	4	-	3	1	-	4	2	2	2	2
TOTALS	204	119	26	59	24	180	109	95	126	78

On the basis of this analysis, it was decided that the sample of six Model C schools would be selected on the basis of the following permutations of characteristics:

Primary; English; Co-educational; Metropolitan; >500;
Primary; Afrikaans; Co-educational; Metropolitan; <500;
Primary; English and Afrikaans; Co-educational; Rural Town; <500;
Secondary; English; Single sex; Metropolitan; >500;
Secondary; English; Co-educational; Rural Town; >500;
Seconday; English and Afrikaans; Co-educational; Metropolitan; >500;

The descriptions and quotations below are gathered from the interviews with principals of each school.

Berea Primary (Primary; English; Co-educational; Metropolitan; >500)

There are approximately 270 pupils in the junior primary department and 210 in the senior primary department, although the capacity of the school is 758 pupils. Until a few years ago, the school was for girls only, therefore the classes are co-educational only up to and including Std 1. In the school there are a total of 17 classes with approximately 30 pupils in each class. However, with the addition of a remedial teacher and a teacher for art and Afrikaans, the teacher-pupil ratio is brought down to 1:26. The school is located in an affluent residential area and many of the parents prefer to send their children to nearby private schools. As a result the school has enrolled children from a wide feeder area including the township of Umlazi. Recent building alterations to the value of R40 000 were done.

Gert Maritz Primêre (Primary; Afrikaans; Co-educational; Metropolitan; <500)

This Afrikaans medium of instruction school is situated in Pietermaritzburg. At the time of the interview there were 625 day scholars enrolled. This high enrolment resulted from the rationalisation in the number of other Afrikaans medium primary schools. It was reported that it was no longer economically viable for the NED to maintain other Afrikaans medium primary schools because of the decreasing numbers of Afrikaans-speaking children in Pietermaritzburg. Gert Maritz Primêre can be described by its strong religious character. It was referred to as a school in which:

> ...we promote Christian principles in the classroom. We have religious education in the school. We especially create time for it, not only during assemblies in the hall when the whole school is gathered together, but we also have special religious education periods, and we have brought in our community's ministers and pastors.

The teacher-pupil ratios are consistent with the ratio of the former NED and school fees were almost R900 p.a. per child. The governing body had appointed additional staff for the teaching of music and the school choir and for work in the school library.

Richards Bay Primary (Primary; English and Afrikaans; Co-educational; Rural Town; <500)

This school is described as a parallel medium school which means that pupils are instructed in separate classes in the medium of English or Afrikaans. Although the school was planned for 700 pupil, there are currently 780 enrolled, of which 55 % are Afrikaans speaking. In each year there are four classes with the average size being between 28 and 30 pupils, although two classes had over 40 pupils each. Although the school serves a middle class community, provision is made for parents who cannot afford the school fees of R730 p.a. An additional six teachers have been appointed by the governing body to reduce the sizes of classes and to ensure the inclusion of culturally-oriented subjects such as art, music and the library. This was regarded as important because Richards Bay is a rapidly growing industrial town. A part-time secretary and several maintenance staff were also employed by the governing body. Admission is determined by place of residence and language ability.

> ...children must live in [the suburb of] Meerensee ... because of the influx of people to Meerensee. [Because of] the building of the Alusaf plant (the smelter), they have built in our area about 140 flats. There are at this point in time about 200 to 250 residential units in the process of being built and I have to make provision for those pupils. ... The other criteria which we are not very strict with is language proficiency. Obviously you cannot teach a child if he (sic) does not understand the medium of instruction.

Durban Girls' High (Secondary, English, Single sex, Metropolitan; >500)

This school has an enrolment in excess of 1100 girls. Despite having a 110 year old tradition of educating the daughters of the white community, it is now proud that it caters for girls of any racial group covering the wide socio-economic spectrum of South African society.

> We are not a special school. We are not a posh school. We are not a smart school. We are just an ordinary school. ...We have people who are traditional, ... from the university right to people whose parents don't work, whose parents are hobos. We have white people who can't pay any school fees... We like to think that one of the school's strengths is that we

> *are just an ordinary school who takes everybody ... at the end of it we want pupils to get the best education they can...*

The compulsory fees for Std 6 and 7 pupils are R1200 p.a. and for the other standards R1400. The differentiated rate is based on the fact that Std 6 and 7 pupils are newcomers to the school and therefore have the expense of new uniforms and basic text books. It is also argued that pupils in the higher standards make greater use of the school's more costly and specialised facilities such as laboratories and art rooms, which accounts for the higher fee rate.

The school has had recent success in an inter-school mathematics competition in which their pupils were the winners. Outside of class time the school offers fee-based adult education classes to the surrounding community. The classes range from cooking to computer courses.

Port Shepstone High (Secondary; English; Co-educational; Rural Town; >500)

Although the capacity of Port Shepstone High is 1500, the enrolment was just under 1300 making this the largest co-educational Model C school in KwaZulu-Natal. There is a boarding establishment with such a long waiting list of applicants that an additional facility is being sought. The school is described as being multicultural:

> *...a large portion of our pupil population is made up of Transkeians. So we find ourselves with [mother tongue] English-speakers, Zulu-speakers, and Xhosa-speakers. Part of our pupil population is also Indian ... and one or two Coloureds... [but] we are predominantly white...*

Initially the school used a written entrance examination as part of its admission policy.

> *Parents used to wait anxiously outside the door while their kids sat inside for two or three hours writing this exam that they had to pass. You could go in there and you could smell fear. It was just a pointless exercise. It took quite a lot of discussion with the governing body who I had to persuade ... without dropping standards, that we could [implement the admissions policy] by an interview.*

Compulsory school fees were R1200 p.a and boarding fees were R2880 p.a.

Linpark High (Seconday, English and Afrikaans; Co-educational; Metropolitan; >500)

The principal of Linpark High described this school as a comprehensive school in that it offers regular academic courses including art, technical courses such as electronics, motor mechanics and fitting and turning, and commercial courses such as economic science, accounting and typing. This range of subjects and the fact that the school has a boarding school and a four-star grading with the National Occupation and Safety Association were said to have given this school a unique character in South Africa, attracting scholars from areas outside of KwaZulu-Natal, including Botswana.

However, boarding facilities are now only available to pupils from KwaZulu-Natal and this has given rise to problems for pupils from neighbouring provinces who have attended the school.

At the time of the interview the enrolment was approximately 770 pupils although the school has the capacity for 950. Compulsory fees were R1500 p.a. and hostel fees were R3600 p.a. The teacher-pupil ratio varied depending on the nature of the subject from 1:16 in technical classes to 1:30 in academic classes such as language and mathematics.

3. LITERATURE REVIEWS

3.1 International literature

The theoretical consideration of centralisation and decentralisation led the enquiry to consider the experiences of countries which had undergone political transitions as emerging democracies. In particular we were interested in countries with a similar social and demographic profile that had tried to implement decentralisation in education. This report includes only the summary of our findings, a fuller version of which has been published previously.[13] It was envisaged that the experiences of these countries would be useful lessons for South Africa as pointers to what does or does not work in centralised/decentralised systems and as examples of the problems that may arise in the future.

In broad terms, the experiences from other countries indicated that neither centralised nor decentralised governance systems are guaranteed to reduce inequality and extend democracy, efficiency or quality. Centralisation and decentralisation have their own strengths and drawbacks, merits and dangers and neither needs to exclude the other. In fact, at any one time an education system can have harmonious features of centralisation and decentralisation.

The results of decentralised reforms can, however, be socially divisive, depending on the reasons for the reform and the way in which it was implemented. For example, in Spain, between 1978 and 1987 decentralisation was used as a strategy to maintain national unity among the provinces (Hanson, 1989). On the other hand, in Nigeria, decentralisation led to ethnic animosity and problems of employment mobility between the provinces (Chinapah, 1991).

In those countries where the motive to decentralise control over schools is economically driven, less powerful groups are likely to remain disadvantaged and financially privileged groups will pay for an educational institution which has better resources, facilities and smaller classes. This occurs where schools introduce fee-based admission policies, leading to the ranking of schools. In Great Britain this has had a divisive effect: those learners with access to better-resourced schools are differentiated by an enhanced social status from their peers at regular schools (Jones, 1989). If, however, the motive is to enable local schools to explore creative ideas which can be repeated elsewhere, then decentralisation can have beneficial outcomes. When schools cater for the diverse needs and cultures within their community over and above the requirements of a national curriculum, decentralisation can be positive. It signals acceptance and tolerance of all in the community.

In the case of a government that implements decentralisation in order to shed its financial responsibilities, the provincial or school authorities - not the national government - will be blamed when there are problems. Where this happens, political decision-makers and stakeholders could react by calling for the re-centralisation of the education system.

---

[13] The full discussion of this review is published in Education Monitor, 5(2) Nov. 1994 and is available from the Education Policy Unit, University of Natal.

Introducing decentralisation without adequate planning will emphasise tensions that are already present in society and entrench the existing power relations. This occurred in Brazil in the 1980s (McGinn and Pereira, 1992), when the poor continued to be manipulated even though school boards comprising elected representatives of parents, teachers and students were set up. Parents in working class districts, especially women, did not participate, either because they did not have time or because teachers and other parents held them in low esteem and they felt intimidated. Similar outcomes occured in Papua New Guinea when provincialised education was introduced (Bray, 1985).

Management functions that are devolved to the local level become a shared responsibility between professionals (i.e. educators and administrators) and stakeholders (i.e. political parties, interest groups, the community, parents and students). When one of these groups is dominant, tensions arise among the other groups because of their expectations of equal participation. If the situation deteriorates decision-making is obstructed. This can also occur when a stakeholder is left out. Fair and even representation is critical to the good working relations of a democratic governing body. In one school in Britain, it was found that the solution was to have groups (excluding students who do not have the legal right to participate in school governance) represented in equitable numbers, and to focus the governing body on tasks and avoid ideological debates (Bowe and Ball, 1992).

The extent and form of participation differs with each form of decentralisation: deconcentrated, delegated or devolved. Unfortunately educational reforms in many countries have been limited to deconcentration rather than the more substantive forms of decentralisation. In these cases governance powers are located with the provinces and districts, but are not extended to local and institutional levels. This situation could easily arise in South Africa because, even though the Interim Constitution devolves power over almost all educational services to the provincial governments, it does not stipulate that similar power should be extended and devolved to local or institutional levels. The Interim Constitution's reference to the existing powers and functions of governing bodies at schools is only a procedural clause related to those occasions when the government may wish to change those powers and functions (Chaskalson, 1995:77-76).

The slow pace experienced by Papua New Guinea in decentralising administrative and policy control over schooling to unprepared provinces without the skilled administrative personnel (Bray, 1985), suggests that South Africa should have modest expectations of the rate at which school reform can be implemented. This is because the injustices and disparities in the apartheid system are so entrenched. Few blacks have had opportunities of advancement as education administrators and many who will participate on governing bodies are educationally disadvantaged. In addition there is a backlog of education resource provision because of the history of gross inequalities. Preparation is necessary for governance to be devolved to local and institutional levels. Organisation development skills are needed to prevent governing bodies being dominated and controlled by a small group of skilled or experienced individuals. For effective participation, stakeholder representatives may require capacity building training relating to their specific governance responsibilities. Administrators of a decentralised system also need training. Papua New Guineans only realised that they lacked experienced regional and local administrators when the process of decentralising education to their provinces was already underway.

In Namibia, although there were training courses sponsored by the United Nations during 1980 and 1987, there were not enough Namibians after independence to take up national and regional education administration appointments to replace the white South Africans who had been employed in the education bureaucracy (Cohen, 1994). A similar situation occured in Malawi in 1964, so that many of the former colonial administrators were retained. In South Africa the training and deployment of new administrators is complicated by the 'sunset clauses' in the Constitution which guarantee the employment of civil servants from the former education departments.

It is logical that a decentralised system which has devolved and democratic governance, should have links between the governing bodies at school level and those decision-making structures at provincial and national levels. This implies that a decentralised system will have more governing bodies and more governance levels than a centralised system. This makes decentralisation expensive and cumbersome because more resources are needed to facilitate the process at lower levels where there are many governing bodies. The multiple levels of governance in a decentralised system, although indicative of greater democratisation, can slow administrative processes considerably. Inertia, however, is also a common complaint about centralised systems. Political developments usually occur at a faster rate than decentralisation can be implemented, giving rise to confusion and problems, particularly among administrators who must implement the decisions of politicians. This occured in Venezuela during 1969 and 1980 when there was a rapid succession of ruling parties that all, in their turn, introduced different reforms (Hanson, 1989).

As a system becomes more decentralised, the role of central government changes. This needs to be carefully considered so that complementary governance relationships develop between the government, provinces and schools. It has been found that tensions between levels are reduced when administrators are trained and prepared for decentralisation so that they have a clear understanding of their functions and responsibilities and use a methodical approach to problem-solving. Lessons from Tanzania indicate that the attitudes, professional competencies and quality of educational administrators are greater factors in the success of decentralisation than policy documents and laws which define the system and stipulate the provision of financial and material resources (Lillis, 1990).

These lessons from international experiences are relevant for South African education policy developers because it shows that the current transformation of our schooling system is not a completely unique and isolated process. Other countries have been through similar transitions. The most salient findings of the literature review were that:

- There is no global trend to decentralisation or centralisation alone.

- Education systems usually have features of decentralisation and centralisation simultaneously.

- Neither centralised nor decentralised governance systems are guaranteed to reduce inequality and extend democracy, efficiency or quality. These goals can be achieved or eroded in either a predominantly centralised or predominantly decentralised system.

- Education systems, despite public proclamations that they serve the long term educational needs of the people, are primarily designed to meet the political interests of the government of the day.

- Changes in the system of school governance need to be planned so that learners, parents, the community, school personnel and administrators are all prepared and understand their roles, the objectives, powers and functions of governance structures, and the outcomes that are anticipated. In particular, provision must be made to ensure that these role-players can acquire the necessary knowledge and skills to perform their functions properly.

3.2 Policy statements of national stakeholders and role players

The main objective of this review of policy statements is to understand how significant South African policy actors conceptualise school governance in the context of the centralisation/decentralisation debate and to analyse their points of difference and convergence.

The previous government's education departments were characterised by a highly centralised and bureaucratic system of school governance, but with some elements of decentralisation. The National Policy for General Education Affairs Act of 1984 established the Department of National Education (DNE), which was administered by the Minister of National Education. Behr(1988:74) states that the Act empowered the Minister, after consultation with ministers of education of different population groups, to lay down the general policy with regard to formal, informal and non-formal education in the Republic of South Africa in respect of the following matters:

- norms and standards for financing the running and capital costs of education;

- salaries and conditions of employment of staff;

- registration of professional teachers;

- norms and standards for syllabi and examinations and certification of qualifications.

The provision of education rested with the racially-differentiated education ministries in terms of the 'own affairs' provisions of the Constitution Act, No. 110 of 1983 (SAIRR, 1984:651). This gave birth to a very complex, contradictory and fragmented system of educational governance and bureaucracy. Nothing highlighted this complexity more vividly than the fact that education provision for different ethnic groups was the responsibility of separate departments with distinct legislation and governance structures.

The extent of decentralisation and autonomy of the different departments was constrained by the fact that decisions about the overall education budget and individual allocations to the different education departments rested in the white HOA cabinet as the real locus of power. As a result, all major policy decisions tended to be made by central government, especially in the DNE, Department of Education and Training (DET) and Department of Education and Culture (DEC):HOA. The departments of the Houses of Representatives (HOR) and Delegates (HOD) were responsible mainly for their parts of the system but took their lead from the DEC:HOA. The latter also applied in the education systems of the 'independent' homelands and self-governing territories of the former apartheid system.

This system of educational governance was the subject of a plethora of criticism. For example, the NECC argued extensively that the basis of centralisation and decentralisation that underpinned the previous system of educational governance could not be justified. The NECC criticised this system not only because it was undemocratic, race-based and discriminatory, but also because it was unequal, inequitable and guaranteed poor quality of education for the majority of the population. The NECC postulated that the main rationale for this complex and fragmented system of school governance was the consolidation of the apartheid ideology. This was manifested by the inequitable and racist distribution of resources to the different education departments which met with severe opposition and non-cooperation from students. Hence, the whole system of education was fraught with crises and the inefficiencies of a bloated bureaucracy. (See for example, NEPI, Chapter 3; Nkomo pp. 424-425; NECC [1989]; NECC [1990]).

During the last four years or so, a number of policy actors have contributed to the policy debates in South Africa, some more than others. We summarise below the positions of each of the following:[14]

- National Party
- Heads of education departments in KwaZulu-Natal
- Teachers' organisations
- ANC and its allied organisations
- Inkatha Freedom Party
- Government of National Unity

3.2.1 National Party

In 1992, policy proposals emerged from the education officials of the previous government. These were contained in the Education Renewal Strategy (ERS) published by the Department of National Education (DNE, 1992). Although these policies were initially camouflaged as a neutral or non-political document, in our interview at the end of 1994 the former minister of education, Mr Piet Marais, confirmed that this document represents the current NP policy on education. Thus, in this review, we regard the ERS document as the NP policy statement on education and refer to it as such.

---

[14] As mentioned earlier, other political parties and organisations were approached with a request for their policy statements. These, however, were not received, despite follow-up requests, and therefore could not be included in this literature review.

The ERS document analyses political centralisation and decentralisation on the basis of unitary and federal constitutions and cites the advantages and disadvantages thereof for education governance (DNE, 1992:17-25). This analysis is preceded by an attempt to define the notion of 'autonomy' and 'original power'. The NP, through the document, argues that autonomy in the constitutional context refers to the ability of a lower level authority to take decisions and to order matters of government without any interference from higher authorities. This sense of autonomy can be established in two ways:

- by being entrenched in the Constitution; or,
- by a decision of the central government to decentralise certain matters to lower levels.

In regard to the first approach, the lower level has devolved and 'original' power is derived directly from the Constitution. Any changes to the Constitution would require special majorities. In the latter case, the autonomy can be taken away at the whim of the central authority, so that in this type of decentralisation, autonomy is purely administrative and delegated.

For school governance, the NP (1992:23-25) suggests two standpoints. Firstly, it suggests the establishment of a central education authority to be responsible for norms and standards in respect of education policy and for institutions of a national character with a large degree of autonomy (i.e. universities and technikons). It further suggests that other functions relating to education can fall within the jurisdiction of regional (i.e. provincial) departments provided that the principle of maximum functionally justifiable devolution of decision-making power to the community or individual institution is upheld throughout. In this context, the degree of management autonomy for different schools would determine the subsidy formula based on a 'more pay more say' principle. That is, the more parents pay for schooling, the greater will be the control they exercise in the school. Secondly, the NP also advances the view that the education system should provide for sharing educational responsibilities amongst political/education authorities at different levels: parent communities, the organised teaching profession and other stakeholders, to ensure effective education for all.

From these standpoints it can be clearly discerned that the NP proposes a limited role for the central education authority and maximum decentralisation from regions (provinces) to institutional levels. In other words, the NP is of the view that provincial and institutional powers of education authorities must be original in the sense of being constitutionally entrenched.

A crucial point to bear in mind is that these proposals were made before the Interim Constitution was agreed to at the multiparty negotiations. They were probably an attempt to influence the negotiations and were quite successful it seems - at least as far as the national and provincial relations are concerned. It is clear even from a superficial reading of the Interim Constitution, that the NP position has been successful in influencing the current formulation of South Africa's education system. It is probably safe to assume that they will fight to entrench provincial and institutional rights in the next constitution.

3.2.2 Heads of education departments in KwaZulu-Natal

The initiative of the five Heads of Education in KwaZulu-Natal,[15] which culminated in the Report of the Natal-KwaZulu Education Working Group (KZNWG, 1992) and its updated version entitled A unitary department of education and training: discussion document for KwaZulu-Natal (KZNWG, 1994a), also contains significant pointers on how education bureaucrats in KwaZulu-Natal view the future governance of schools. For the purpose of this analysis our concentration is on the latest version, referred to as the Document (KZNWG, 1994a) and the Supplementary Report (KZNWG, 1994b). The Document (KZNWG, 1994a:3) states that:

> *The authority for the organisation and control of education must be devolved as far as possible to regional (provinces), area, local and school levels. There must also be provision for democratically elected management councils to ensure parental, community and teacher involvement. (Student involvement requires further debate with relevant role players).*

The Document (KZNWG, 1994a:5) further argues that the devolution of authority to regional, area, local and school levels will expedite decision-making, reduce frustration caused by bureaucratic delays, promote efficiency and enhance public confidence. The Document (KZNWG, 1994a:6) proposes four levels of administrative and professional management structures, namely, provincial head office, area office (that would render services to approximately eight local offices with a pupil population that could exceed 500 000 pupils), local office and school levels. The general policy and governance for the province would, however, be determined by the head office officials together with other (unspecified) role players.

The Document (KZNWG, 1994a:25) goes on to suggest the establishment and development of advisory structures at all levels, for meaningful interaction between role players and to promote vertical and horizontal communication in the development of policy, monitoring the implementation of policy directives and research and development to improve and further educational goals.

---

[15] This group comprised senior administrators from the KwaZulu Department of Education and Culture, Natal Education Department, Department of Education and Training, Department of Education and Culture (House of Delegates) and the Department of Education and Culture (House of Representatives).

The following table illustrates the proportional representation which the Document recommends for school governance structures.

School enrolment	Principal	Next senior staff member	Parent elected	Teacher elected	Other co-opted members
< 100	1	1	3	1	1
101-300	1	1	4	2	2

Although the parent constituency appears to have the highest representation, the proportions of this formula ensure that parents are always equal to the number of representatives who are employed at the school. It must be noted that no specific provision is made for student representation.

There is no differentiation between the powers and functions of the state and state-aided school management councils. This suggests that their powers are identical and to some extent similar to school management councils in state-subsidised schools except for minor differences (KZNWG, 1994b:69-71). For a summary of similarities and differences, see the table below. Though the state-subsidised school is not defined, from an examination of the differences of powers and functions, it can be concluded that the former Heads of Education in KwaZulu-Natal regarded a state-subsidised school as being similar to a private school, in the sense that in the past private schools have always received subsidies from the state.

Comparison of the powers and functions of school management councils in the KZNWG documents

Similarities	**Differences (state/state-aided school management council)**	**Differences (state subsidised school management council)**
• Set school goals • Determine school policy • Mouthpiece for school community • Advise and be represented on Local Management Council • Advise PHE • Determine school dress • Monitor school performance • Advise principal on school matters • Report annually to parents and educators • Form committees • Create unsubsidised posts and pay using other resources • Promote activities of shool constituencies • Raise funds for the school	• Recommend appointment/dismissal of staff • Interfere in educators' professional work • Levy voluntary school fees in compliance with law	• Appoint/dismiss staff according to relevant Acts • Control and audit finances as prescribed in Acts • Levy school fees which are recoverable by law • Represented at Labour Relations Council • Shall not interfere with educators' professional work

3.2.3 Teachers' organisations

There are two major national teachers' organisations existing in South Africa, namely SADTU and NAPTOSA. The position of SADTU as an ally of the ANC is discussed below in the section on the ANC because of the convergence in the SADTU and ANC policy positions. For the purposes of this section, only the policy position of NAPTOSA is discussed here.

NAPTOSA is a federation of different teachers' associations. Despite the obvious relevance to its constituency, NAPTOSA has no formal written policy on school governance.[16] However, one of its former affiliates, the NTS,[17] has developed comprehensive proposals on the Organisation and administration of education (Nicholls,1992). These proposals are critically discussed not as a position of NAPTOSA, but more as a reflection of some of the thinking among the members of its affiliates.

Nicholls believes that one of the guiding principles that should underpin the new system of school governance is that:

> *...the organisation of education should encompass a single ministry in charge of schooling with a maximum decentralisation of decision-making to regional and local structures and institutions, with a concomitant devolution of administrative, financial and professional powers* (1992:9).

There is no explanation of what is meant by 'financial power', whether it refers to power to raise money and if so, by what means, or whether it refers to the power to decide on spending priorities.

To realise the above stated principle, Nicholls proposes a three tier system of school governance, namely national (macro), regional (meso) and local (micro). According to Nicholls (1992:10), the Ministry of Education under the Minister of Education, would only be the overseer of all educational matters at national level through a system of commissions. It is proposed that there would be three commissions responsible for:

- schooling;
- higher education (universities, technikons and education colleges);
- post-secondary education (non-higher education such as community colleges, career education, literacy and educational backlogs).

The role and powers of the national level of school governance are fairly circumscribed, couched in terms that are broad and general. This substantially shifts the locus of power, administration and control away from the national to the regional and local levels. Thus decentralisation features prominently in these NTS proposals. For example, Nicholls (1992:10-11) states that:

---

[16] As per telephonic discussion with Mr P.A. Pyper, on the 16 August 1994.

[17] NTS amalgamated with the Society of Natal Teachers (SONAT) late in 1994 to form the Association of Professional Educators of Kwazulu-Natal (APEK).

a) *The national education ministry would function along the lines of the current "general affairs" concept with "own affairs" being a geographically regionalised system on a far more autonomous and co-ordinated basis;*

b) *The regions would be the primary unit of the education system, allowing maximum devolution of powers and responsibility to local structures to realise a real local autonomy and local self-determination;*

c) *A mechanism of education control via education councils similar to old provincial councils would be established. These councils would provide for an elected (lay) and nominated (professional/administrative) representivity; and*

d) *Local education departments/districts which may be linked to municipal structures, would control close to 200 000 - 250 000 pupils.*

At institutional level, the NTS does not indicate what form and constitution governance structures would assume, though it does expressly mention (Nicholls, 1992:12) that:

a) *parents should have a clearly defined say in matters affecting them; and*

b) *structures should accommodate students' input and negotiations, possibly via students' representative councils (SRCs).*

3.2.4 ANC and allied organisations

In the context of this literature review, 'allied organisations' refers to the mass democratic movement, i.e. the organisations which share more or less similar policy perspectives with the ANC.[18] To understand the position of the ANC and its allied organisations on school governance, it is important to consider this position at two levels. Firstly, in relation to what have been the broad strategic objectives of the ANC during the apartheid era and how these objectives translated into educational goals and secondly, how the issue of centralisation/decentralisation is conceptualised in the ANC's Policy Framework for Education and Training (1994b) and the governance section of the Implementation Plan for Education and Training (IPET) (1994a).

Since its inception in 1912, the ANC's broad strategic objective has been to destroy apartheid rule and establish a united South Africa based on non-racism, non-sexism and democratic rights for all. For the ANC, this strategic objective encompasses amongst others: single nationhood, equitable distribution of resources and opportunities, an end to all forms of discrimination and divisions within society and a redress of the imbalances created by apartheid (ANC, 1994c). This objective was translated into an educational goal in the call for the establishment of a unitary and dynamic system of education and still remains a key demand of the education sector within the ANC and its allied organisations.

---

[18] Organisations like the National Education Co-ordinating Committee, Congress of South African Students, South African Students' Congress, Congress of South African Trade Unions, South African Democratic Teachers Union, etc., fall within this category of policy actors.

In terms of educational governance, the issue of centralisation/decentralisation was not interrogated until fairly recently. This is largely because the idea of the ANC coming to power in a non-unitary state was not considered feasible. The National Education Policy Investigation (NEPI), a project of the NECC, represented an initial attempt by the ANC and allied organisations to grapple with the implications of centralisation/decentralisation in educational governance. The NEPI report on Governance and Administration (1992) discussed the issue of the centralisation/ decentralisation of education governance in the context of a critique of the NP's ERS document and provided policy options for the mass democratic movement to consider.

NEPI(1992:20) argued that the support of decentralisation in the ERS, on the pretext of accommodating diversity and ideological differences, was primarily intended to safeguard minority privileges and perpetuate the existing inequalities in the provision of education in South africa. NEPI (1992:29) dismissed as implausible and misleading the approach of reducing the debate to a simplistic dichotomy between systems that are centralised and those that are decentralised. NEPI (1992) found that the conclusion many of the studies came to was that it must be understood that all systems are characterised by both centralised and decentralised policy functions. Therefore, NEPI (1992) advocated a view that the problem should be conceptualised broadly in terms of the limits and possibilities of transferring power over specific policy functions to different levels of the system.

In a Regional Policy document, the ANC advocated a three tier system of government, but regarded the notion that decentralisation automatically brought government closer to the citizenry and would act as a buffer against centralised bureaucracy as myopic and naive (ANC, 1992:7). The ANC stated that the autonomy of regional (i.e. provincial) and local governments cannot be absolute and to caution against allocating powers exclusively to a single tier of government. The ANC thus proposed concurrent powers among the three tiers of government, with overriding powers reserved for central government.

The education and training policy framework of the ANC (1994a) proposed a four tier system of governance, namely: national, regional, local and institutional. In terms of this proposal, education was envisaged as a concurrent function of central government and the provinces, sharing the responsibility of ensuring that education policy formulation is fair, efficient and directed towards the promotion of human development in all its aspects (ANC 1994a:23). The ANC also envisaged an important role for local governance and management structures in planning and co-ordinating education at district/local level. Furthermore, the ANC (1994a) argued that institutional governance needed to be strengthened in order to be participatory and efficient.

Through the IPET report on governance (ANC, 1994b) the ANC translated their broad policy framework into an implementation strategy. This report proposed that Education and Training Co-ordinating Councils should be established at national and provincial levels, to exercise, among others, the following powers and functions (1994b:54):

- advising the Minister/MEC on any matter that it or the Minister/MEC deemed necessary;
- undertaking certain executive tasks as may be delegated to it by the Minister/MEC;
- involvement in education crisis intervention and mediation;
- monitoring the expenditure of the former and new departments of education;
- monitoring progress towards the integration and rationalisation of the education and training system and the development and functioning of the system in general;
- employing administrative personnel, research and other staff to allow the national and provincial co-ordinating councils to carry out their own functions, funded through the national/provincial education budget;
- playing a co-ordinating and mediating role and receiving regular progress reports from subordinate structures.

Sub-provincial structures were proposed between local and provincial level governance structures, their number varying between 2 and 5 depending on the size of the province. However these structures would simply be administrative with no governance powers and functions (ANC, 1994:54). The IPET report also envisaged the establishment of Local Education Boards comprising representatives from individual school governing bodies. The powers and functions of these Boards would be similar to the national and provincial governance structures, but only in so far as they related to local government.

The ANC and its allied organisations advocate the democratisation of school governance structures. In this regard the formation of PTAs at primary school level, and PTSAs at secondary school level, has been encouraged. The centrality of parent, student, teacher and community representation in the composition of these structures has been accorded high priority. However, the name that was suggested for the school level governance structure was 'school board'. The IPET report (ANC, 1994:56) also proposed that a consultative process to review the whole issue of school governance should be embarked upon. The following issues were identified as critical to the agenda of this review process:

- Composition/representation: How should representatives of parents, teachers and students be elected? What should be the status of different representatives? Should some pupils with expertise be co-opted?

- Powers and functions: Should these bodies be advisory bodies or statutory bodies with powers to adopt and implement school policy?

- Principals, inspectorate and local education authorities: What should be the role of departmental officials?

- Relationships: What links and lines of authority should there be between administrative structures and governance structures?

The ANC also argued that the establishment of different levels of governance structures must be accompanied by a vigorous national training programme to build and sustain the capacity of different representatives so as to ensure an effective and efficient system of school governance (ANC, 1994:57).

Thus, driven by their objective of democratising the entire education system, the ANC and its allied organisations identified an important role for central government while they recognised that certain functions could be allocated to other tiers of educational governance.

3.2.5 Inkatha Freedom Party

Although a detailed educational governance policy of the IFP was unavailable, statements made by Dr Vincent Zulu (1993)[19], the MEC for Education and Culture in KwaZulu-Natal and member of the IFP Central Committee, offer insight into the position of the IFP. In an address given at a college of education, Zulu (1993:6) categorically stated that in a federal system of government such as that advocated by the IFP, education should be the prerogative of 'states' rather than the federal government. He acknowledged that federal government may, however, play a role in the formulation of national standards, especially in respect of tertiary education. Zulu accentuated that the management of the whole education system should be vested in each state and that through the principle of subsidiarity, the management of schools and tertiary institutions shall also be devolved to appropriate management bodies with strong elected representatives of communities.

In a 1994 address, Dr Vincent Zulu proposed that:

> *... the overall shape of the [Education] Department's structure will be that of a flattened pyramid. There will be a relatively lean head office component which will be located in Ulundi and which will be staffed by a relatively few senior officials and there will be semi-autonomous adequately staffed regional and circuit offices strategically located*

---

[19] See also an information brochure entitled Inkatha Freedom Party Education Policy (undated), issued by the IFP Information Centre, 126 Umgeni Road, Durban. Coincidentally, the content of Dr Zulu's address, except for the introduction, conclusion and some minor changes, regurgitates word for word the entire content of the information brochure. We can speculate that his address was based on the brochure or alternatively, that the latter was based on the former.

> *throughout the province to bring the service to within comfortable reach of the schools and teachers.*

Although the above statement proposed the maximum decentralisation of the education bureaucracy, the IFP has been silent concerning the governance structures envisaged from the provincial to institutional level, the powers or functions which would be exercised at different levels and the role of stakeholders in education policy formation and governance. There is also a marked difference in Dr Zulu's statement and the IFP's past practice of administering the KwaZulu Department of Education and Culture (KDEC) through strongly authoritarian line functions. This suggests either a fundamental shift in IFP education policy or a marked difference between policy and practice.

On the whole, IFP education policy is premised on the federal system akin to the United States, where the governance of education is in the control of states (such as South Africa's provinces), district education boards and school councils, where parents, because of their financial support to education, have significant powers. This suggests that the IFP has common ground with the NP on the devolution of power to schools, based on the principle of 'more pay, more say'.

3.2.6 Government of National Unity

The GNU is a form of multi-party, shared power. It was implemented after the first democratic elections in April 1994, resulting from multi-party negotiations that formulated an Interim Constitution as a uniquely South African political settlement.

Within the GNU, the National Ministry of Education has developed a comprehensive White Paper on Education and Training (DoE, 1995c), containing policy guidelines on school governance. These guidelines were developed in a manner consistent with the provisions of the Constitution and epitomise the compromises that have become the hallmark of the GNU itself. In the White Paper, the GNU committed itself to ensuring that:

> *The principle of democratic governance should increasingly be reflected in every level of the system, by the involvement in consultation and appropriate forms of decision-making of elected representatives of the main stakeholders, interest groups and roleplayers* (DoE, 1995c:22).

Since the GNU must operate in a manner consistent with the provisions of the Constitution, in which both the national and provincial governments are competent to make laws on the provision of education (except universities and technikons), the White Paper stated that the National Ministry of Education acknowledge that it had to work in consultation and collaboration with provinces. To institutionalise this collaborative relationship, the White Paper announced the creation of the Council of Education Ministers (CEM), comprising the National Minister and the Deputy Minister of Education, and the nine provincial Ministers of Education. Similarly, a structure consisting of the heads of national and nine provincial Departments of Education, known as the Heads of Education Departments Committee (HEDCOM), was also created (DoE, 1995c:47). Essentially, three tiers of school governance were identified: national, provincial and school level. However, the National Ministry of Education, while not suggesting that local government should be assigned powers to govern education, indicated that it was in favour of creating a fourth tier of school governance at a local or district level:

> *The Ministry of Education is not suggesting that local government should be assigned powers to run educational services... The point is that the moral climate of non-racial local government negotiations is likely to influence, hopefully for the better, a similar process in local (or district) school governance...*(DoE, 1995c:69)

Also important in the GNU's position on school governance was, firstly, a commitment that school bodies and other consultative forums at national, provincial and local/district level should be representative of the main stakeholders, with parents being given a special role; secondly, that for the new school governance and management to be effective and efficient, capacity-building and training programmes would be mounted (DoE,1995c:70).

Essentially, although the position of the GNU on school governance reflected compromises among the various components of the GNU, the influence of policies of the ANC and its allied organisations are clear. This is not surprising because the ANC has had the majority in the GNU and has also developed the most comprehensive policy perspectives on school governance for South Africa. Nevertheless the policies of the GNU were still in the process of development at the time of publication of this report.

In September 1995, the report of the Committee to Review the Organisation, Governance and Funding of Schools recommended that there should be only two categories of schools: public and private. All public schools should have governing bodies made up of parents, teachers and (in secondary schools) learners as well as representatives of the larger community. The report suggested that governing bodies should have wide-ranging powers over school policy; this would entail much greater powers than ever before for all schools except Model C schools. It also recommended the provision of capacity building programmes to provide training for members of governing bodies. The report's recommendations would have curtailed the powers of Model C school governing bodies in two main ways: they would lose the power to determine their own admissions policy which would now be determined by provincial governments and they would no longer be in a position to determine and enforce compulsory school fees. As far as funding is concerned, the report set out three options but favoured one which provided for the payment of compulsory fees on a sliding scale according to parental income.

The draft of the second White Paper (*The Organisation, Governance and Funding of Schools*) adopted the substance of most of the recommendations on school governance. However, it did not commit the government to any particular path with regard to funding and school fees as it stated that further studies needed to be done in this respect.

3.2.7 Analysis of the points of difference and convergence

Our analysis of the position of different policy actors reveals that there are similarities and dissimilarities in their conceptualisations of centralisation and decentralisation of school governance at sub-national levels. Let us look first at the similarities.
In the first place, all except the NP were unanimous that there should be four tiers of school governance, namely national, provincial, local/district and institutional level. The NP saw no need for a local/district level. A fifth level, the area level, between the provincial and local/district levels, was mooted as a possibility by the ANC and KwaZulu-Natal Heads of education departments. However, there was also agreement that the area level would be an administrative, rather than a governance level.

Secondly, all actors acknowledged and recognised the centrality of stakeholders and community participation in educational policy initiation, formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Others (all except the IFP and NP) even suggested institutional mechanisms to realise this participation. In this regard the NTS proposed that education councils similar to the old provincial councils, which once operated in the House of Assembly schools, should be established. The ANC, its allied organisations and the GNU suggested the formation of stakeholder bodies such as Education and Training Co-ordinating Councils, which could be replicated at local and/or district level. They also proposed PTSAs and PTAs as school level structures of governance. These structures were envisaged as mechanisms that would encourage democratic participation in school policy matters and establish partnerships between schools and communities. The KZNWG called for the establishment of advisory structures for meaningful interaction between role players.

Thirdly, there was general acceptance of some centralisation/decentralisation of school governance, but the extent to which this should be carried out was the main source of contention.

Though there were points of convergence among the different policy actors, major differences abounded. Most of the differences were akin to the debates concerning the Interim Constitution which characterised the multiparty negotiations before 1994, and which continued into the Constituent Assembly.

Firstly, as noted above, the different actors did not agree on the extent of centralisation or decentralisation that should occur in school governance. On one hand, all parties (except the ANC) argued for maximum decentralisation and autonomy from the central level to the provincial, local/district and institutional levels. Most of these parties saw provincial governance as more important than national, district/local and institutional levels. On the other hand, the ANC and its allies argued that there was no dichotomy between centralisation and decentralisation and that the extent of centralisation and decentralisation depended on which policy functions would be located at particular governance levels. They regarded all levels as equally important in terms of the policy functions.

Secondly, in terms of the issue of competencies, the ANC and allies were of the view that there should be concurrent powers between the central education authority and provinces but that the national authority must have overriding powers. In addition, they advocated the view that, though the national level must have overriding powers, in principle, no level of school governance must have absolute powers. In contrast however, others, especially the IFP, strongly believed that the provinces must have overriding powers when both the national and provincial levels share competency for education. According to these actors the locus of power was to be with the provinces instead of the central authority.

Some gaps could also be identified in the positions of all the policy actors. For example, although there was agreement about the need for local school governance structures, none of the actors had explored the role of local government in the administration and financing of education. An equally important question that was not addressed was how education provision could be coherently and effectively linked to other services offered by local government in order to facilitate integrated planning, for example: health, welfare, education and training, etc. Likewise, they had not considered how resource sharing, for example, of personnel or office space, could be managed in order to optimise the efficient use of resources. It is also significant that only the ANC, its allies and the GNU regard training and capacity-building for governance as important and crucial in bringing about the effective participation of stakeholders in the design, implementation and monitoring of education policies at all levels.

3.3 Review of conference papers and proceedings entitled 'Towards a New Framework for School Organisation'

There were no resolutions at the end of the conference, thus this review only reflects the individual or organisational presentations and the summations which tried to capture the consensus and/or disagreement among the conference participants (Greenstein et al, 1995). The hetero-political nature of the conference was not suited to an outcome of conference resolutions. Furthermore, the conference recognised that the School Review Committee attending the conference were responsible for making recommendations to the Minister of Education. Nevertheless, the conference proceedings were useful in that they reflected a more detailed vision of school governing bodies than was found in the literature review of policy statements

In terms of governance structures, a distinction was drawn between governance and management/administrative structures. It was agreed that governance was located in those structures which have power to make policy decisions and which are accountable to the constituencies that elect them. At institutional level it was proposed that governing bodies should be uniform, irrespective of the type of school. There was acceptance of a four tier system of governance, i.e. national, provincial, district and institutional level, and that all governance structures should be legal and statutory, having an advisory, watchdog and lobbying role. The advisory function would be possible only if there was representation of all relevant stakeholders so that there would be no policy adoption without their interests being taken into account.

The usage of the definition of 'school' as in formal schooling was questioned on the basis that it was narrow and excluded the possibility that such schools may be used to deliver early childhood education and adult basic education and training. The governance of such multi-use institutions was not regarded as requiring special consideration.

Several key issues concerning governance at school level were repeatedly identified by various presenters:

Powers and functions of school governing bodies

No definitive list of the powers and functions of governing bodies was compiled during the conference. Nevertheless, the chairperson of the Parliamentary Select Committee on Education, Dr Blade Nzimande, stated that this was a key challenge for the government because schools are a 'site of power and certain interests that cohere around that' (p.42). Dr Nzimande proposed that some form of flexibility among governing bodies should be considered so that the school community could define the role which it wanted the governing body to take in its school.

The South African Federation of State Aided Schools (SAFSAS) argued that the principles of governance should be compliant with the Constitution but should also make provision for community differences. There appears to be implied support in this argument for the perpetuation of a differentiated and unequal system of schooling. SAFSAS also stated that schools receiving financial aid from the state should have devolved powers, accompanied by the liabilities and obligations of school property. Such schools would therefore attain greater autonomy and have responsibilities similar to private schools. In their position papers, SADTU countered this by stating that it was untenable for schools which only contributed 20% towards their expenses to be given the privilege of almost total autonomy (p.48) and the Congress of South African Students (COSAS) criticised the governing bodies of Model C schools for being undemocratic and lacking direction.

In the commission on governance there was support for an executive committee elected by members of the governing body, which should be responsible for implementing decisions of the governing body and interacting with the school management team. In addition, the governing body could establish sub-committees such as a curriculum committee, school development committee, disciplinary committee and finance sub-committee. These sub-committees would be constituted by all stakeholders. The basis of sub-committees would be to ensure that parental/community support for the school is consistent and extends beyond the annual general meetings and when major decisions about the school are taken. This implies that there would be sub-committee meetings and other broad meetings of the entire school constituency that are fixed in advance to allow for effective community participation.

Composition of Governing Bodies

As statutory bodies, the composition of these structures should operate on the principles of inclusivity and representivity to ensure that different stakeholders and role players are afforded an opportunity to effectively participate in the development of educational policies. There was general acceptance that school governing bodies should comprise teachers, parents, students and other key community stakeholders. COSAS argued strongly for the participation of student representatives. Both Dr Nzimande and Ahmed Essop of the centre for Education Policy Development, raised the issue of the parent constituency by calling for a broad definition of 'parent' because in South African communities the parental role is frequently played by members of the extended family or a neighbour, even if that person is not legally the guardian of the child (p.43; p.144).

In the commission on school governance, participants advocated a simple and flexible model of governance which would provide for broad participation of all stakeholders in the affairs of the school. It was proposed that the name should be general to all school governance structures so that confusion could be avoided. The structure should be constituted by elected students representatives who, ideally, are members of a democratically elected SRC; elected teachers representatives who are not elected narrowly on the basis of their political or union affiliation but on the basis of the confidence placed in them by the teachers; and elected parents in the broader community sense. It was envisaged that the principal of the school would have ex-officio status on the governing body and that there could be co-options where additional special skills, expertise and knowledge were required. The number of elected representatives should also be flexible and determined by all the stakeholders.

Transitional arrangements

There was the widespread view that the priority is for transformation to occur at the point nearest to the delivery of schooling, i.e. at institutional level. SADTU called for the immediate commencement of *bona fide* negotiations with Model C schools as provided in section 247 of the Constitution (p.50).

The relationship between the state and the school was a matter which concerned some participants who were worried about state interference in areas which they considered should be locally determined. These fears are founded on the assumption that the interests of communities are necessarily in conflict with the interests of the state. Others agreed that within the context of South Africa's popular democratically elected government, these fears reflect the interests of minority groups who were privileged by apartheid and these fears do not find expression among the majority of the population.

Linkages between school governing bodies and governance structures at other levels of education were considered important mechanisms to ensure the coordination of policy planning and implementation. In addition, such linkages would provide consistency in the full democratisation of school governance and ensure that policy is developed to be appropriate to the needs at institutional level. Participants felt that the issue of districts and the role of local government in school governance would require further elaboration. They were of the view that the linkages between the different levels of governance must be explicitly spelt out. However, it was acknowledged that it may not be possible to establish governance structures at all levels simultaneously;

Capacity building programmes

Capacity building programmes for governing bodies were not a disputed issue at the conference because it was agreed that such programmes were needed to ensure the sustainability of governing bodies and develop the financial and organisational capacity of members. It was also recognised that these programmes would play an important role in the process of democratising school governance and ensuring affirmative action for marginalised groups such as women within the various constituencies. No details for these programmes were proposed, except to indicate that management and financial skills would form key components.

4. FINDINGS OF THE INTERVIEW DATA

4.1 Stakeholder interviews

In general there was consistency between our understanding of stakeholders' policy documents (see 3.2 above) and statements made during their interviews (see Appendix 2) to which we refer below. On the whole there was agreement that governance over schooling should be decentralised to sub-national levels and that there should be stakeholder participation. However, the differences of emphasis which were found in the policy documents were also apparent during interviews. The DP, NP and NTS endorsed decentralisation which accommodates the notion of devolving power, i.e. giving decision-making authority to lower tiers of governance. This would enable school governing bodies to exercise autonomous powers secure from interference from higher levels of authority.[20] The ANC proposed decentralisation which featured power and functions shared by different levels of government in order to emphasise participatory democracy through the inclusion of the stakeholders relevant to the various levels. These concurrent powers would empower the national level to establish countrywide norms and standards which the ANC perceived as necessary within the given South African context of entrenched systemic disadvantage and differentiation.

Two major phenomena caused some of the stakeholders to modify their positions in recent times. The ANC, NP, DP and the NECC all cited the following:

- the bilateral and multi-party negotiated settlement which led to the 1994 democratic elections;
- the paradigm of a government of national unity in which different parties are involved in joint decision-making and governing through both national and provincial parliaments.

Both the ANC and NECC identified that these settlements resulted in a system which presents the challenge of accommodating meaningful 'bottom-up' participation while still enabling the implementation of national norms and standards to address the apartheid conditions of disadvantage and marginalisation.

The foundations of the interviewees' positions were both experiential and ideological. The ANC's position, supported by SADTU and NECC, was informed firstly, by the historical demands of marginalised communities reacting to the experience of the apartheid education system which was highly centralised, but racially differentiated and fragmented and characterised by 'talk-down' decision-making without stakeholder participation.

---

[20] This was confirmed in the Daily News (7/8/95), which quoted Roger Burrows of the DP as saying parents should 'take back their rights' to reconstruct and maintain their schools. The newspaper reported the DP position as being that the state should merely be a provider of resources and schools should be free to select their own textbooks and course content.

Although the NTS shared some similarities with the DP ideological position (below), their endorsement of stakeholder participation at lower levels of governance was based on experiences of overly centralised and bureaucratised decision-making processes and a reaction against the imposition through the apartheid education system of the ideology of Christian National Education.

Interviewees of the KZNWG presented a moderate experiential perspective which stated that there should be consultation and co-ordination between the governance structures at various levels. They argued that decentralisation would be more efficient than centralisation and would avoid the dangers of centralised ideological control.

The ANC stated that the necessity to democratise teaching and learning included the democratisation of school governance even if this presented a tension between *representative democracy*, i.e. the legitimate authority of elected governments, and *participatory democracy*, in which stakeholders are involved in decision-making processes that affect their daily lives, such as the running of a school.

The DP supported devolved decentralisation as a result of its basic philosophy which places greater value on the notion of 'the individual' as distinct from 'the mass' or 'the volk'. Thus the DP argued that decisions need to be made as close to the individual user as possible and that the individual should be involved in making decisions concerning his/her own life existence. The extent to which these devolved powers should or should not be subject to the powers of other structures such as national or provincial governments was not probed. However, media reports in August 1995 indicated that the DP supported devolved powers for school with a minimum of state involvement and interference.[21]

4.1.1 Governance levels

Establishing governance structures at various levels of the schooling system is not a controversial issue, given the display of agreement in the following table. The only striking feature is the NP's silence on a governance structure for the intermediate level of district/circuit. This suggests that the NP sees the provincial and institutional levels as being the most significant levels of influence and power in schooling and therefore, that an intermediate governance level is redundant. This interpretation would be consistent with the past practices and policy positions of the National Party government (see 3.2.1 above) and possibly stems from a desire to create as much autonomy as possible for school communities which are more racially and culturally homogeneous than districts would be. In such a system, stakeholders would play no role at intermediate levels in the coordinated planning and development of circuits or districts and where links existed between school governing bodies and the provincial stakeholder body, they would be weak.

---

[21] ibid.

Levels of Governance

	ANC	DP	NP	SADTU	NTS	KZNWG	NECC
Province	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
District/ Circuit	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
School	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

There was unanimous agreement that there must be a structure of governance at provincial and school levels. Although there are differences over the nature and extent of powers and functions, the need for a governing body at school level was expressed eloquently by the NECC:

> *...it is at the lowest possible echelons of the education system where the people know exactly what their need is, where the people know exactly where to go, and if at that level our people are involved, then they are able to influence the government...*

The ANC saw the PTA or PTSA as the governing body for all institutional governance and proposed that such governance bodies should be statutory. Although the KZNWG referred to such bodies as being advisory, the statutory and advisory nature of such structures need not be mutually exclusive.

The NP argued that parental and community involvement was important at the level of school governance so that they can:

> *... particularise their inputs because the needs of communities differ depending on what their cultural needs and their language needs and also religious needs would be.*

However, the NP did not acknowledge the problems surrounding differentiation (of class, culture, language and other characteristics of communities) and discrimination except to say that:

> *... it will not be possible to lay down [a] uniform set of rules because the communities and the ability to accept autonomy differ so much.*

4.1.2 Powers and functions

i. National level

Although this study concerns sub-national governance structures, stakeholders were asked to suggest which powers and functions they would expect the national governance structure to have in relation to provinces. All stakeholders saw the setting of national norms and standards as a legitimate function of the national government. The particular powers and functions which were mentioned spontaneously by the interviewees included:

- to set norms and standards;
- to assist in setting up the provincial departments;
- to ensure the eradication of all forms of discrimination;
- to evaluate whether set norms and standards have been adhered to;
- to give clearer guidelines for governance structures at institutional level;
- to form a consultative body to act in an advisory and watchdog capacity to the Ministry of Education;
- to coordinate policy on, for example, examinations, age admission levels, inspection etc;
- to ensure that provincial education policy is in line with constitutional rights;
- to coordinate policy so that the application of broad guidelines agreed to by all parties is applied by national government to the whole education system;
- to coordinate a more equitable distribution of resources, where those provinces with greater financial resources would finance those with less;
- to standardise teachers' salaries, conditions of service etc.;
- to set pupil-teacher ratios;
- to standardise core curriculum;
- to standardise all types of certification;
- to legislate a ten-year compulsory period of education;
- to develop national guidelines which could be adapted by the different provinces.

It can be assumed that although this is not a definitive list of powers and functions, it is these which the stakeholders regarded as having the most import. No marked differences between the stakeholders emerged in the interviews.

However, sharp differences (not apparent at the time of the interviews) did emerge later between some of the political parties interviewed - largely due to the conflicts of underlying philosophy. Varying emphases along the centralist-federalist spectrum led to a serious clash in parliament in December 1995. This occurred when the National Education Policy Bill was referred to the Constitutional Court by the minority parties in parliament. While all parties were happy to have the national government determine norms and standards in education, the smaller parties differed strongly with the ANC majority on what these norms and standards should be.

ii. Provincial level

The comments made by interviewees only gave a general indication of the powers and functions which stakeholders regarded as being salient. These included:

- that provincial government should have the power to implement and evaluate legislation on schooling;
- that provincial consultative structures, for example provincial forums, should be statutory with strong advisory powers;
- that the bulk of powers and functions with regard to implementation of national and provincial policy should rest with the provincial government but that these should not contradict national policy, for example on language and curriculum;
- that the decision-making powers at provincial level should be distinct from those at national level;
- that provinces should extend national policy and formulate provincial policy, norms and standards;
- that teachers salaries, conditions of service etc. should not be determined at provincial level but at national level;
- that a consultative process be built into policy determination at provincial level with regard to the structure and distribution of teaching posts, merit awards, evaluation, appraisal etc.;
- that provincial policy should in many ways mirror national policy;
- that provincial education departments should monitor themselves in order to maintain national norms and standards;
- that provinces should coordinate policy-making and research;

55

- that conflicts between education authorities and teacher organisations and unions be resolved at provincial level wherever possible;
- that the extent of the powers and functions of school governing bodies be negotiated between schools and provincial governments;

It should not be construed that if stakeholders omitted to mention certain powers and functions, they regarded these as being irrelevant to this governance level. Most comments consistently indicated support for provincial governance structures to be given consultative powers and functions which would interpret and extend national policies.

iii. Regional/district/circuit level

In most cases, stakeholder positions on the powers and functions at the level of districts/regions and/or circuits were not well formulated. This may be because this intermediary level was not used for governance by the former National Party government and therefore stakeholders had no prior experience or ideas about the possibilities of governance at this level.

The most clearly articulated positions were from the ANC and its allied organisations, SADTU and the NECC. For these stakeholders, this level was perceived as being potentially useful in de-racialising and democratising the schooling system. It was envisaged that institutions would be administratively grouped or zoned into circuits/districts or regions. By redrawing the administrative boundaries to ignore the former departmental divisions and possibly coincide with local government boundaries, urban schools would be grouped non-racially. This could result in former Model C schools being located or zoned with schools from the former HOR, HOD, DET and homeland Departments of Education. However, it was acknowledged that large areas, particularly in rural areas, would still be predominantly African.

Within the context of a de-racialised intermediate administrative level, the ANC suggested that a governance structure at this tier would have decision-making powers and functions that are predominantly re-distributive in their planning and scope:

> *...sharing resources within a particular education locality... like sports facilities and a whole range of other facilities, as well as the provision of other educational services... In terms of personnel, recruitment of teachers into localities. What you want to facilitate also is the redistribution of skills, personnel... actual distribution of teachers and placement. Requisitions also for a whole range of other resources, books, stationery, sports facilities and other things, they should be happening at that level. And that relates to the whole issue of redistribution, because you are forcing the better schools to compete and share with the poorer schools, so that one could achieve some kind of spread of resources at that level...how many Maths teachers, which schools do they go to, and so on...*

In addition, it was envisaged that this governance level would 'adapt the provincial plans into local implementable programmes'.

Despite the clear distributive proposals of the ANC and its allies, there appeared to be a tendency to confuse administrative and governance functions at this level. For example, SADTU only referred to administrative functions such as management and determining the required number of teachers and school programmes and the NECC proposed that intermediary structures would:

> *...adapt the provincial plans into local implementable programmes...the local, on behalf of the national ministry, could then do the setting up of a teacher, enter into a contract...*

The DP, NTS and KZNWG saw this level as being limited to administrative functions and implementing provincial policy, while the NP did not consider this intermediary level as having any governance functions.

iv. Institutional level

The specificity and variety of powers and functions mentioned by interviewees, suggests that the stakeholders are familiar with institutional governance and have well-developed positions on it. The ANC stated that the governing body should be 'a very powerful PTSA or PTA and that it should be a statutory body'. There is ambiguity in the NECC's proposal that the governing body need not necessarily be a 'state structure' although government should make a 'contribution' to the structure and give it full state recognition. The NECC describes governing bodies as 'organs of the people, which people can utilise to air their grievances [and] their frustrations'. Although initially this appears to contradict the ANC's proposal that the structure should have statutory status, this need not necessarily be the case. The NECC's proposal can be understood within the context of its constituency's previous experiences of disenfranchisement and marginalisation of the majority of South Africans and of governing bodies which were not representative of school communities and neither accessible nor accountable to those communities. Within the social context of an emerging democracy, it is understandable for a mass-based organisation such as the (former) NECC whose constituency was predominantly disenfranchised and disadvantaged people, to highlight democratic characteristics of representivity, accessibility and accountability.

The KZNWG described school governing structures as having only advisory powers. However, as occured concerning the intermediary level, stakeholders argued for governance structures with functions that border on administration and management:

> *...actually running of the school - all aspects of the school, both relating to professional curriculum matters, as well as managing the resources of the school, including fund raising...*

There was divergence with regard to the employment of staff. For example, the DP and KZNWG stated that governing bodies should give input on selection of staff including promotion of staff, while SADTU rejected this and limited the powers of the governing bodies to teacher appraisal. This position was supported by the NTS.

4.1.3 Composition of governance structures

In response to the question regarding the composition of governance structures the interviewees mentioned the possibility of representation for the following sectors:

Provincial level

- Parent, Teacher, Student organisations
- Civics and CBOs
- Business
- School governing bodies
- NGOs
- Department of Education officials

Intermediary level

- Civics
- CBOs
- School governing bodies
- DoE officials

Institutional level

- Parents
- Teachers
- Students
- CBOs
- Broader community

The ANC proposed that particular attention should be paid to including those people who were excluded from decision-making in the past. This was described as an affirmative action approach because it was realised that there is inequality among stakeholders. The ANC argued that some stakeholders are well-resourced and experienced and are therefore more able to push decisions in their own favour.

The primary concern of the NTS was for the inclusion of teachers and teachers' organisations in governance structures. In addition, their support for the inclusion of various types of community-based stakeholders at all levels was seen to be important because:

> *...we do believe very strongly in schools being integral parts of the communities in which they are located and in which they serve... One of the great needs in our former black areas is, in fact, for the communities to feel a sense of ownership and interest in and involvement in the schools...*

The composition of a governing body at school level was a critical, emotive and potentially divisive issue. Without representivity, role-players and stakeholders would decline responsibility for the development, progress and maintenance of the school. On the other hand, a governing body which included representatives of all role-players and stakeholders would have acceptance from all those governed by the structure. Exclusion of certain role-players and stakeholders would undermine the legitimacy and decisions made by that body. However, the NTS suggested that the composition of governing bodies could be linked to the type of school and the powers and functions of those bodies:

> *If you're talking about a Model C-type thing where you do fundraising and have responsibility of a certain kind, that's one [consideration], but with the state [school], it might be slightly different in emphasis..*

While the ANC did not share this viewpoint, it was flexible on the issue of legislated representation by saying that it might vary from community to community.

> *You don't want to hamstring governance at institutional level by a web of rules and regulations, particularly at a time when you can't legislate too strongly for something that is still emerging. You want to legislate in order to give very clear directions that we are moving away from undemocratic structures... [and] from sexist and racist structures. We are pushing for participation, but you allow flexibility for the people to experiment and learn from their own experiences as well.*

At face value there was unanimity among all the interviewees that parents and teachers should be represented on school governance structures. However, on close scrutiny it was apparent that the definition of these stakeholders (i.e. parents and teachers) was a matter of dispute. The inclusion of student and community representatives at secondary schools was not opposed in principle, but neither was it seen to be obligatory in all governing bodies.

The DP defined the parent constituency as parents of children currently in the school, to be clearly distinguished from the broader community, which the DP also accepted as a separate stakeholder. The argument for this distinction was that parents whose children attend the local school have a direct responsibility to that school and thus have a greater right to make decisions about the school than neighbours who may have children attending a school elsewhere. The NTS however, accepted the possibility that the parent constituency could nominate someone who does not have a child at that school. Although the NTS had not formally adopted any policy positions on the composition of governing bodies, it suggested that argument could be made for the parent constituency of a particular school to include those people who will, in the future, have children attending the school, as well as those parents whose children are shortly to leave the school. The ANC, SADTU and the NECC wanted to ensure community and parent representation on the governing body but did not take issue to distinguish sharply between the two.

With regard to teachers, the DP included non-teaching staff employed at the school in this constituency. SADTU supported this interpretation saying that the entire school staff should elect representatives to the governing body and if these representatives were members of SADTU, they should nevertheless represent the interests of even those members of staff who were not SADTU members. The NTS argued that representation of the teacher constituency must be more than just the management staff of the school, although it was stated that the proportion of teacher representatives need not necessarily be equal to those of the parent representatives.

Student representation on the governing body was generally accepted for secondary schools, but there were differences among stakeholders regarding the inclusion of students in the primary level. The ANC supported the inclusion of student representatives on governing bodies but stated that this need not be necessary in primary schools. This position was also adopted by the DP and the KZNWG. The NTS, however, suggested that the involvement of primary school pupils on the governing body should not be completely dismissed because exposure to such governance experiences would prepare pupils for the role they would have to play in secondary school. Although the NECC did not commit itself specifically on the issue of student representation in the interview, it upheld the principle that governing bodies should be inclusive of all stakeholders. The NECC has a longstanding position on the importance of student participation in governance in secondary schools.

Although the DP acknowledged that parents are from the community, they maintained that representation of the broader community should be through civic, labour, business or community-based organisations. The NTS believed that schools should be an integral part of the community in which they are located and which they serve. The NTS thus argued that it was necessary to implement mechanisms which provide opportunities for communities to articulate their views in relation to their schools and participate in the decisions being made by the governing body. The ANC, SADTU and NECC stated that business, labour, civics and non-governmental organisations which are involved in education should, within the broad framework of the notion of 'community', have representation on the governing body.

The KZNWG stated that principals and other senior management staff should have *ex-officio* status on the governing body. This was supported by the SADTU interviewee.

Differential representation of the various role-players and stakeholders was supported by the KZNWG,[22] while the ANC was uncommitted on this issue because communities differed from school to school. However, the ANC stressed that the key to the issue of representation was the creation of mechanisms that would enable each community to determine the representation of the various role-players and stakeholders. For example, legislation should not be prescriptive with regard to the representation of students, but governing bodies should provide students with the opportunity to participate in democratic processes and prepare themselves for leadership positions. Another alternative was advanced in the NTS proposal that governance of a school could permit different permutations of stakeholders to participate in different areas of engagement or decision-making.

---

[22] This approach is discussed above in section 3.2.2

There was a great deal of consensus among those interviewed on the matters which should be within the power of governing bodies although there was divergence on the detail of those powers. These matters included curriculum and textbook matters, managing the human and material resources of the school, fund-raising and finances.

The DP specified that the governing body should participate in decisions concerning language medium, the courses and co-curricula activities offered at the school and the selection of staff.

The NP stated that if a governing body accepted full responsibility for certain matters, this should be coupled with a comparable degree of autonomy. This link was based on the notion that the greater the contribution made, the greater the entitlement to power.

Although the KZNWG envisaged that governing bodies should have 'a fair degree' of autonomy, they did not specify the justification for this.

The ANC argued that governing bodies should be statutory and powerful because stakeholders have a democratic right to participate in decision-making which affects their lives. Despite recommending that the governing body should be statutory, the ANC cautioned that it should not be hamstrung by a 'web of rules and regulations' especially in the case of South Africa where the notion of a democratic governance structure was still emerging at institutional level. It was suggested that at the outset, any new legislation for governing bodies should clearly indicate a departure from sexism, racism and the undemocratic governance structures of the past, while still remaining flexible for communities to determine the degree of representation by the various stakeholders. Regarding the status of the governing body, the NECC suggested that it need not be regarded as a state structure although it should be recognised by the state as the governance structure at school. Within this framework the governing body was envisaged primarily as a community structure.

SADTU, KZNWG, NTS and NECC had strong positions on the power of the governing body in relation to professional staff. SADTU maintained that governing bodies should be involved in determining the teachers needed at a school, assist with conflict resolution between students and staff and participate in teacher evaluation and appraisal. However, SADTU stated that these powers should not extend to the 'hiring and firing' of teachers, nor should the governing body have total power in the professional matter of curriculum. The NECC agreed with SADTU's position and proposed that governing bodies should only make recommendations regarding the employment and expulsion of teachers. The KZNWG did not commit itself on the employment of teachers but stated that governing bodies should be involved in the placement of teachers. The NTS was not opposed to governing bodies being involved in the appointment of staff but strongly rejected parental participation in staff assessment on the grounds that the process of appraisal is a professional matter which should be left to professionals.

Regarding the issue of school governing bodies having links with governance structures at other levels of education, such as district and provincial levels, none of the interviewees were more specific than to state that such links should exist through some mechanism of representation.

4.1.4 On Model C schools

Access to Model C schools

One of the central objections to the notion of the formerly whites-only schools that became Model C schools is that they are perceived to be an attempt to restrict accessibility to schools by people of other racial groups by putting admissions policy in the hands of governing bodies elected by parents.

Conditions in 1995/96 are remarkably different, but at the time of the interviews (1994) when interviewees attempted to approximate the racial enrolment in 1994 at these schools, they estimated that there were only between 10-12 per cent pupils from African, Indian and 'coloured' racial groups. Although there are no reliable statistics, the present percentage of pupils from other racial groups enrolled in Model C schools is much higher. This can be attributed to numerous factors such as the commitment of the national ministry and the majority of provinces to ensure access to public school regardless of race, religion, language, culture or ability to pay school fees.

Elitism

There was unanimity among all interviewees that Model C schools are elitist. They argued that restrictive admissions and exclusivity are the main principles which underline the elitism of Model C schools. The NP indicated that the idea of establishing Model C schools was not intended originally to promote elitism but was financial, in response to a Cabinet-imposed budgetary cut of R640 million.

> *Taking into account that about 80% of education departments' budget goes into salaries, when I sat down and started looking for ways and means to deal with that problem, all I could see [was] the retrenchment of 11 000 or 12 000 teachers. ... I got the organised teaching profession in regard to white education, i.e. statutorily it was the Teachers' Federal Council. I got the parents organisations in ... and I explained the problem to them. ... In the end we came up with the possibility of large scale changing over to Model C schools. ... I thought that politically that would be impossible ... But instead [the then] State President de Klerk thought it was a good idea...*

During the interviews, the following points were given as evidence which attested to the elitism of Model C schools:

a) The emphasis on admission requirements such as academic results, language proficiency, cultural and race biased admission tests.

b) The NECC, SADTU, NTS, ANC and KZNWG identified that fees at Model C schools were beyond the reach of poor and working class families and parents were threatened with legal action if they failed to pay the fees. Model C schools were therefore said to be the exclusive preserve of affluent families, black and white. The only relief for white working class pupils was the policy of the former House of Assembly's Department of Education and Culture that no white pupil was to be excluded from the school simply on financial grounds. As a result, in 1994 limited state subsidies were available for poor white pupils, but not for blacks.

c) All the interviewees, with the exception of the NP, stressed that, because of the disproportionate per capita expenditure per pupil under apartheid education, Model C schools were excessively well-resourced in comparison with all other schools, especially farm and community schools catering for Africans. Model C schools had the best qualified teachers, low teacher-pupil ratios, and used advanced teaching aids such as computers and videos, while other schools barely had enough textbooks.

d) KZNWG pointed out that Model C schools had a higher quality of teaching and learning.

Some of the interviewees, for example the DP, pointed out that elitism was not something that was first introduced through the Model C school system. These interviewees argued that some public schools for whites were elitist long before the introduction of Model C schools because of the tradition of voluntary contributions from parents and better state funding.

The DP predicted that elitism would remain indefinitely in the school system as schools strived to achieve and maintain high academic standards. The NTS was of the opinion that elitism would shift from being race-based to being class-based.

To address the problems of elitism, a number of recommendations were made by the interviewee stakeholders. These are summarised below.

i. The ANC, SADTU, NECC and KZNWG recommended that to increase accessibility to Model C schools and schools in general, the entire system of schooling had to change fundamentally. Ways must be found to de-racialise schools, such as through the re-demarcation of catchment boundaries and circuits. The ANC added that the school curriculum which was based on the old culture of apartheid should also change. Similarly, the ANC maintained that both pre-service and in-service teacher training programmes needed to change in order to improve learning qualitatively. SADTU proposed that legislation should clearly stipulate the terms and conditions of access to schools, and the penalties for non-compliance.

ii. For the ANC, SADTU and NECC the quality of education and training had to be improved by redressing the historical imbalances, by providing equitable funding and through the redistribution of services and learning resources such as subject advisers and qualified teachers, especially in specialist subjects such as mathematics, science and technology.

iii. The DP proposed that good schools should be identified nationally. These schools could be earmarked for exceptionally talented pupils, and where access would be based on a competitive academic basis, and not on affordability.

iv. SADTU, ANC and NECC saw an urgent need to review the variety of types of schools, including private schools, with a view to rationalising them. (The government has in fact now adopted a reclassification of schools into only two models, public and independent). They stated that no consideration should be given to the privatisation of any state schools.

v. The DP, NTS and KZNWG wanted the title deeds of schools to be given to the broader community where the school was located, rather than to a handful of parents as was the present case. This would encourage the decentralisation of authority away from the central or provincial level to the local community which could be involved in the maintenance and repair of school facilities.

vi. The NTS suggested that the state should regulate admissions policy by placing a ceiling on the amount which parents should contribute, by subsidising those pupils who could not afford to pay and in the actual educational programmes offered by the school.

Capacity to accommodate diversity

All the interviewees except the NP, agreed that Model C schools were by their very nature assimilationist, with Black pupils passively absorbing and identifying with the dominant western culture. The NECC argued that cultural assimilation posed serious problems when Black pupils returned to townships. They experienced an identity crisis and behaved like 'honorary whites' and then became alienated from other children in the township. The NP suggested that there may also be cases in which teachers themselves were inadequately prepared to deal with the issues of multi-culturalism.

In explaining the problems facing Model C schools, the NTS argued that they were conceived and introduced too hastily and were forced on parents and schools. This occured without adequate planning and without consideration for the problems which might be generated by their introduction. Various interviewees expressed the view that Model C schools were not introduced mainly to admit other racial groups to whites-only schools or implement full racial integration. Other non-educational reasons were proposed by some interviewees as underlying the implementation of this Model.

Firstly, the ANC and KZNWG said that it was a means of coping with the crisis of dwindling numbers of pupils at white schools and the threat that schools faced closure due to their capacity being under-utilised. Secondly, NECC contended that Model C schools were established as a reaction to the pressure on the apartheid state to open schools to all pupils and to the threat that whites-only schools would be forced to admit students from other race groups through *en masse* occupations, and defiance of state policies. Thirdly, the ANC pointed out that to white parents on a governing body it made financial sense to admit students from other racial groups because this would increase the numbers from which the governing body could collect school fees in order to meet the overheads for which the governing body was liable.

The stakeholders interviewed were aware that although some bridging programmes had been introduced, these programmes differed from school to school. They all expressed doubts as to whether the content of these bridging programmes holistically addressed the problems facing multi-cultural classrooms and schools and thought that they might simply be an academic and language proficiency support system. The NTS expressed their concern that money was needed to sustain bridging programmes, but that there was no external support from the state, the community or business to help schools build their capacity to address the issues of multi-cultural education and to accommodate the diverse educational needs of students. KZNWG noted that pupils who had attended multiracial pre-schools coped very well with second language tuition and in general were acclimatised easily into the multiracial school environment.

The ANC was adamant that problems of overcoming racism could only be addressed through the complete de-racialisation of schools, by addressing the composition of governing bodies and teaching staff and through the introduction of new democratic management practices.

Innovations

There were mixed responses to the question of whether Model C schools were innovative in their teaching methodologies and curricula. The ANC maintained that to the extent that they embark on creative activities to improve academic and social life in the schools, Model C schools could be said to be innovative. However, the ANC also pointed out that these schools had hardly begun to grapple with the realities of an emerging new South Africa. Model C schools were culturally biased in favour of white pupils. There were no drastic shifts away from traditional methods of teaching and many still confined themselves to the old apartheid curriculum. The ANC argued that the intention to create Model C schools was not to initiate innovative educational changes but to protect the privilege and status of these schools by securing their autonomy.

The DP saw the power of governing bodies to hire additional staff, offer special subject packages and raise and manage the income and expenditure of the school as enhancing the school's capacity to be educationally innovative. However, the DP also said that it was fallacious to link Model C with innovation because many Model C schools were innovative even prior to their being changed to that Model. Conversely it was also true that there were state schools that were innovative and Model C schools that were not.

The NP maintained that Model C schools were innovative in their teaching methodologies although a new curriculum was needed.

SADTU did not agree that Model C schools were innovative. SADTU believed that the wealth of resources available at these schools determined their ability to use effective learning and teaching methodologies. They also raised the concern that because of the financial structure of Model C schools, some governing bodies were trying to cut costs by employing additional staff who were under-qualified. In the long run these measures would be detrimental to the quality of the teaching at these schools.

The NTS saw some degree of innovation in Model C schools, especially in the development and resourcing of the schools and in learning and teaching methodologies. However, the NTS contended that a Model C school's capacity to be innovative was constrained by the fact that they were hastily conceived without proper analysis of the developmental needs of staff and parents regarding the professional and governance aspects of planning. The NTS also maintained that good schools are good schools irrespective of their status as state or state-aided schools.

The KZNWG suggested that giving parents greater decision-making powers had led to innovations being implemented, although this was constrained by the availability of financial resources. KZNWG indicated that better trained and qualified teachers in Model C schools contributed to their being more innovative than other types of schools.

Although the NECC was highly critical of the manner in which Model C schools were introduced, it acknowledged that there were some innovations, especially in the model of school governance and the extent to which parents were involved in decision-making processes. The NECC suggested that in this respect Model C schools could provide invaluable lessons for future school governance policy proposals.

Governing bodies

a) Socio-economic profile

Regarding the question of whether the governing councils reflected the socio-economic profile of students, the NP, KZNWG, ANC, SADTU and DP were all in agreement. They stated that in general, governing bodies comprised affluent middle-class and professional people. This was the trend even for those schools located in working class areas. The racial and gender composition of the governing body was usually not a true reflection of the student body. According to the NP the main reason for this state of affairs was that within the white community, workers and people in the lower echelons of society tended not to attend parents' meetings. It is suggested that this may be because they feel inferior and lack confidence.

The NTS on the other hand, believed that governing bodies did mirror the socio-economic profile of the students. Nevertheless, NTS pointed out that it was in the best interests of the school to mobilise talented parents (lawyers, accountants, professors, business personalities, etc.) and elect them to the governing bodies. This ensured that the considerable powers given to the parents were positively utilised and exercised in the best interests of the school.

b) Extent of their powers

All interviewees agreed that governing bodies had more powers than their predecessors. The following executive, as opposed to advisory, powers were identified.

- control of the type, number and racial composition of pupils to be admitted;
- determination of fees payable and to some extent, power to enforce payment;
- employment, promotion, dismissal and discipline of staff;
- autonomy to manage and utilise school resources;
- the capacity to sue or be sued as a 'juristic person';
- determination of subject packages and other extra-curricular activities on offer,
- determination of school budgets;

c) Accountability of governing councils to parents and education authorities

On the question of the degree of accountability of governing bodies to the education authorities and parent community, the interviewees had different perceptions.

The ANC and KZNWG felt that there was a shift in the accountability of the governing body in relation to education authorities. The latter were presently acting as consultants providing assistance and guidance to the schools, rather than was the case in the past when officials were regarded as inspectors. As a consequence, direct accountability to the education authorities had been severely weakened. On the other hand, accountability to parents had increased, although this situation was not satisfactory because those few parents elected to the governing body often only consulted with the principal of the school. It was commonly perceived that the principal and chairperson of the governing body ran the school and only consulted parents on major policy issues such as determining how much money should be levied.

The DP was of the view that the existing governing bodies were not ideal in terms of representivity and that their constitutional framework was not sufficiently transparent and accountable. Governing bodies only reported to parents at the Annual General Meeting and this was inadequate. Regarding accountability to education authorities, the DP saw this as simply a question of conducting inspections. The DP also identified the need to establish norms and guidelines which spelt out how governing bodies exercised their powers without infringing the rights of others, especially in matters such as the hiring and firing of teachers.

The NP believed that governing bodies were more accountable to parents and less accountable to the department. It qualified this position by citing the active involvement of parents in the affairs of the school as a measure of the extent of accountability of the governing body. The NP also indicated that one of their objectives when Model C schools were introduced was to confer as great a degree of autonomy as possible on the governing body, without necessarily giving them the power to interfere on professional matters, other than the appointment of teachers.

SADTU was concerned that the accountability process only involved a narrow parent community and not the broader community. NTS concurred with this concern and added that parents took decisions that they judged to be correct under the circumstances, but without consulting the broader community about the implications of their decisions. The result was that once the children of those parents had left the school, others had to deal with the consequences of decisions that they had not made. KZNWG was similarly concerned about the need for the governing body to be accountable to parents, in that once the few parents were elected they became a most powerful body until the next annual elections.

The NECC was uncertain about the degree to which governing bodies were presently accountable to parents, but supported the principle that governing bodies should be accountable to the constituency which elected them. The NECC argued that in the past the NECC had stood for parental participation in school governance structures such as the PTAs, but that to strengthen the accountability of the governing body, teachers and students should also have representation.

d) Composition of governing bodies

The interviewees were all in agreement that the present situation where governing bodies were constituted of parents and the principal only was not ideal. They all believed that it should be obligatory for parents, teachers and students, especially at high school level, to be involved. They also agreed that the broader community - local business, civic and local authority representatives - should be involved as a means to ensuring inclusivity and the democratisation of governing bodies and also to broaden their areas of accountability.

e) Training of governing bodies

In response to the question of whether some form of training or capacity-building was necessary for members of governing bodies, there was unanimity that this was indeed important. The following reasons were advanced:

i) To enhance greater participation and quality of management.

ii) To empower those elected with knowledge of the legislation governing schools.

iii) To ensure that specialised skills such as legal or financial skills are not concentrated among the one or two members who may be professionals in these fields.

iv) To shift the narrow technocratic focus of governing bodies to a much wider approach which includes school policy design, analysis and development.

A number of suggestions were made for the implementation of a training programme. The DP was in favour of training being facilitated by provincial departments of education, in addition, tapping the experience and expertise already available within or outside the education departments. Seminars could also be organised around specific themes. KZNWG suggested that capacity could also be increased through other mechanisms such as circulars and newsletters.

Fears and concerns about the future of Model C schools

Asked about their fears and concerns regarding the future of Model C schools, all interviewees argued that it would be undesirable for South Africa if the quality of education offered at Model C schools was to decline during the transitional period. The ANC expressed this concern by saying that South Africa could not allow the quality of education to decline to the extent that there would be a massive influx of pupils of all background to private schools. However, the ANC added that its goal was not to retain Model C schools, but to transform the entire schooling system and to raise quality throughout the system.

For the DP, freedom of choice remained a paramount ideal, whereby parents would be able to exercise their individual right to choose where and how their children should be educated. The DP was fearful of a situation in which all schools would be reduced to 'the lowest common denominator'. The DP also argued that it would be foolish for any government to ignore the financial contribution that Model C parents had made to education over and above their normal taxation.

The NP, as architect of the Models system, was confident that Model C schools would continue and prosper.

SADTU's primary concern was that existing legislation and the Interim Constitution could be used to retain Model C schools intact and thus perpetuate the inequities of the past. SADTU elaborated and qualified its position of rejecting Model C schools by arguing that a review of all school types was not a rejection of the positive elements of Model C, which should be replicated in the whole school system. SADTU stressed that it was eager to see the government revisiting the notion of state-aided schools and setting criteria for the allocation of subsidies and developing mechanisms for the redistribution of learning resources.

The NTS stated that Model C schools were competing for more children to be enrolled in order to maintain their financial viability. The NTS viewed the autonomy of Model C schools as inherently problematic from a financial point of view, regardless of whether they remained all-white or not. The other concern of the NTS was that there were multiple employers because governing bodies were themselves employers and this created problems for teacher unions and impacted on teachers' accountability.

KZNWG cautioned that the power given to governing bodies was located with only a few parents and this could easily be misused for narrow, selfish ends. Examples were cited of principals who had been accused by governing bodies of corruption for allegedly misappropriating school funds. KZNWG emphasised that the exercise of power had to be balanced so that all stakeholders were involved in decision-making.

The NECC was critical of parents who were not willing to make available the resources of Model C schools to all of South Africa's people. The NECC argued that striving for and maintaining quality education should be done simultaneously with the reconstruction of the whole education system and the empowerment of disadvantaged communities.

Strategies for the future

The ANC was committed to a complete review of all school types and in the process strove for quality in teaching and learning in all schools. This was supported by the NECC and SADTU, who stated that Model C schools should not be privatised.

The DP supported the expansion of state-aided schools and believed that more 'schools of excellence' should be established through a systematic distribution of highly qualified teachers, especially in the subjects of science and mathematics.

The NP's response concerning the future of Model C schools was merely to suggest that those schools which refused to admit pupils from other racial groups should be taken to court. The NP supported the idea that Model C schools (or something very like them) should continue to exist.

SADTU believed that there was a need to conscientise and interact with the communities whose children attended Model C schools to make them realise that their interests and aspirations were inseparably linked with other communities.

The NTS stated that it should be possible for schools to be state-aided, but that this must not include the transfer of property ownership away from the state. This view was echoed by KZNWG who suggested that the expertise and resources of Model C schools should be optimised by clustering schools through programmes such as the twinning of schools, peer pupil contact and teacher exchanges.

Negotiations with the government

The ANC, SADTU and NECC stated that negotiations should be aimed firstly, at creating an efficient and high-quality public school system and not merely at the modification of the Model C concept. Secondly, such negotiations should be inclusive so as to involve all other school types and not just the Model C schools. Thirdly, these negotiations should be conducted at either provincial or national level. Fourthly, the trust deeds of Model C school property must be returned to the state. This was also supported by KZNWG. The NTS however, argued that property should be the responsibility of the broader community in which the school was located, rather than the few individuals on the governing body.

The NP argued for the retention of the status quo. This position was similar to the DP's which was that title deeds should remain with the governing body as long as there was a clause which provided for ownership to revert to the state if the school ceased to exist. The only modification suggested by the DP was that the disciplinary powers of governing bodies should be curtailed, especially with regard to teachers.

4.2 Interviews at Model C schools

4.2.1 Innovations

Interviewees were asked to comment on whether their schools, since becoming Model C, had implemented any innovations within the curriculum and/or in the teaching methodology used. This question was not directly related to governance. However, we wanted to probe the common assumption that schools that have a high level of devolved power and less interference from departmental authorities have more freedom and therefore are more innovative, resulting in qualitatively better teaching and learning than schools without devolved powers.

a) Curriculum

We found that some interviewees perceived their schools to be innovative, while others did not. For example, one principal remarked that:

> *...we have two classes where we offer them a kind of different curriculum, a more challenging curriculum, a more critical thinking curriculum, a more do-your-own-independent sort of thing. All we guaranteed parents was that the kids would not fail. We chose pupils who we felt would benefit, so it was not only the clever children. We took the divergent thinkers, interested kids, who we felt probably would be better under a more free and easy scheme.*

Some interviewees indicated that they followed, to the letter, the curriculum guidelines and requirements of the syllabi set by the NED. At one school the values and ethos of the school were still articulated within the general framework of Christian National Education. Another interviewee did not regard their school as innovative, but saw it simply as offering a unique permutation or menu of subjects that were not available to learners elsewhere in the province. It can therefore be said that the nature of the school (e.g. if it was a technical and/or specialised school) and the language of instruction (particularly when it related to the cultural identity of a minority group), were perceived to be influential determinants of the level of curriculum innovation.

It was found that sometimes there were differences of opinion between respondents from the same school. For example, most principals and governors indicated that there was some level of innovation at their schools, but at times the latter were ambivalent and uncertain in terms of providing concrete examples. Occasionally governors argued that the governing body was responsible for functions such as maintenance and therefore were not informed about instructional issues at the school, which they believed did not fall within their ambit but were the responsibility of principals and professional staff.

It is interesting that most of the teachers felt that no innovative curricula changes had been made since their schools became Model C. Some, however, expressed the view that Model C schools offered a potential environment for innovation because of the freedom accorded teachers to make decisions in what they considered to be the best interests of learners in a particular context, rather than being dictated to by departmental officials. However, most teachers did not concur with this view.

The types of curricula innovation most commonly referred to were related to media centres used as resource bases for learners as they became more self-study orientated and cultural activities involving music and the arts. However, there was no indication as to whether the media centres and cultural activities were introduced before or after the advent of Model C. Teaching group dynamics and entrepreneurial skills were also examples of curricula innovation.

b) Teaching methodology

Some respondents argued that it was the low teacher-pupil ratio in Model C schools which enabled experimentation with new learner-centred methodologies. It was further alleged that archaic and orthodox pedagogical approaches were no longer practiced.

Several respondents pointed out that it was a fallacy to regard the use of new teaching methodologies as an innovation that could be ascribed to the introduction of Model C, because the NED had always offered an enabling and flexible environment which included opportunities for experimentation.

Other respondents, however, did not agree that there were any methodological changes in Model C schools. They claimed that curriculum rigidity and departmental requirements for examinations left teachers with little time to explore new methods in an experimental way.

One school had introduced two 'project' classes in which curricula and methodological innovations were specifically encouraged.

> *It has been incredibly successful in terms of working in groups, because when you leave school, you never ever work on your own. You always have to be part of a group or nearly always, so we teach them group dynamics and how to get on... They do more subjects than the others. ...They potter around and they go out a lot. They do surveys. They went and did a thing on informal trading in Durban this year, and they went and interviewed all the people...*

In addition, project classes to cater for children with learning difficulties or language proficiency problems were cited as examples of areas where teaching methodologies had become innovative in other schools.

Some respondents viewed changes taking place in their schools as an extension of programmes initiated when they were still state schools. In other words, innovations which had been introduced were not started from scratch but were an improvement of programmes initiated long before Model C came into being. There was consensus, however, that Model C allowed more opportunities and scope for significant improvement in school organisation and instruction in terms of what is taught and how.

Other respondents attested to changes in the role of inspectors to superintendents, who were advising rather than prescribing to teachers, as indicative of changes brought about in Model C. Another example given, related to the fact that the general management and administration of the school was autonomous from the department officials. Implementing methodological innovations are not always well received or supported.

One principal reported that there were criticisms from staff who were not used to seeing school learners in a less structured learning situation using the fax machines in the school administration office, usually off-limits to students. However, at this same school, encouraging the use of less formal methods among a few teachers has had a beneficial impact on other teachers:

> *What really happened was that the teachers taught better. That was their own analysis after our first year [of the innovative 'project' classes]. Nothing [structural] actually happened. It was just that they taught better because they sat down and said 'Why are we doing this?' and 'How are we going to do it?'. ... It takes a lot of preparation, a lot of thinking beforehand so that you are free in the lesson.*

All this seems to suggest that greater school autonomy can provide the opportunity for innovative, less rigid teaching methodologies, but does not necessarily have this result. It appears that if the school (principal and staff) are well motivated and creative they can take advantage of the decreased control to innovate, but this doesn't happen in all schools.

The ability of individual schools to charge fees would seem to be related to innovation in the curriculum as well as improvements in teaching methods through the acquisition of better teaching materials and additional equipment. In addition, Model C schools have had the power and funds to hire staff to service the specialised facilities of the schools.

There appeared to be only one school that was measuring the effectiveness of their innovative programmes. This school referred to their achievements in terms of fewer end-of-year failures, awards at inter-school competitions and the enthusiasm among teachers and learners.

4.2.2 Diversity

A school's capacity to cope with diverse learners is closely linked to issues of innovation and responsiveness. Model C schools have little, if any, experience of multi-cultural learning and teaching. We posed the question about diversity among the learners because we wanted to guage how these well-resourced schools had coped with this challenge and whether they had responded by introducing special programmes.

In introducing this issue, we asked interviewees about the racial composition of their schools. We found that, in order to be seen to be practicing non-racism, the former departments administering Model C schools no longer require these schools to keep statistics of the racial composition of scholars. It is therefore not possible to accurately monitor the rate of racial integration. Nevertheless these schools gather statistics on the mother-tongue of scholars and these can be used as an indicator - albeit inaccurate and ambiguous - of race. For example, in 1995 Model C schools in Gauteng province (Gauteng, 1995) had an average of 11,5% scholars who spoke an African language as their mother-tongue. The larger proportion of scholars, i.e. 88,5% would have included 'coloured' and Indian scholars.

Of the schools surveyed in this study, pupils enrolled were predominantly white (ranging from 90 to 100%), so that at the time of the interviews, problems of diversity were negligible. This was accounted for by the fact that although these schools allegedly had open door admission policies, in real practice they were still exclusionary. Statements such as:

> *...we are admitting children from the area we serve, from our residential area...*
>
> *...naturally, admission depends upon the child's ability to communicate effectively in Afrikaans...*

are vivid examples of exclusionary practices.

Some schools which had enrolled pupils of other racial groups used the following approaches:

- Established or were contemplating bridging programmes for students with learning difficulties, especially for language proficiency;
- Made students from poorly resourced schools repeat grades or do what was termed a holding year;
- Offered classes exclusively for African students.

Some of the teachers expressed the view that teaching pupils from different backgrounds had personally enriched them as educators. It had exposed them to the different cultural contexts and experiences of their pupils.

We also found that coping with diversity, with few exceptions, meant that the Black students were assimilated into the dominant white culture. For example, one of the schools established a Cultural Club, ostensibly to assist students to learn and teach one another about their culture and customs. Some members of governing bodies, based on the feedback they got from their children, were quite impressed with the way integration had been handled by the school. However, in some schools it was noted that pupils still tended to play and interact along racial lines.

4.2.3 Socio-economic profile of governing bodies

At all the schools surveyed, except one[23], at least one interviewee indicated that their governing bodies were *not* representative of the socio-economic profile of their students, despite the fact that the members are supposed to be elected by the parents themselves. There were many reasons for this anomaly.

Firstly, two representatives of governing bodies indicated that the process of election required the agreement of nominees. They maintained that people therefore 'volunteer' themselves for nomination and such parents are usually characterised by their commitment to the school and their interest in their children's education. These interviewees maintained that the apathy and/or uninvolvement of the majority of parents in school activities contributed to the discrepancy between the socio-economic profile of learners and the governing body.

Secondly, members of governing bodies were often elected because of their expertise and for the contribution which they could make to the running of the school. These members tended to be professional or business people. One principal pointed out that this had the potential to become a problem because such parents could easily decide to raise school fees beyond the rate of affordability for the majority of parents at the school.

One principal who stated that the governing body was representative, was from a school that was located in a middle to low income area and members of the governing body were white-collar workers and housewives. Another principal who felt that the school's governing body did reflect the socio-economic profile of learners was contradicted by both the teacher and the governing body representative. One principal initially stated that the governing body was representative 'because of the democratic manner in which they were elected'. This position was then immediately modified when he admitted that the majority of members were professional men.

The overall evidence of the interviews reveals that members of governing bodies were elected on the basis of their skills and the position of responsibility which they held within communities, for example, as a mayor, priest, businessman/woman or professional person.

Principals often referred to the hesitancy and reluctance on the part of Black parents to make themselves available for election or cooption to the governing body. Unfamiliarity with school governance matters and misapprehension were seen to be the major reasons for this response:

> *They are not willing to come forward. I don't know why. ... The governing body sounds very pompous and 'up there', and I think they are frightened of the term, when in actual fact we are just a group of people who get together once in a while to discuss what is good for the school. I think that*

---

[23] While this primary school maintained that its governing body reflected the socio-economic profile of the learners, the principal pointed out that it did not reflect their racial profile.

> *once they get over that and realise that it's not a big board meeting, they might be willing to come forward [for election or cooption].*

Other reasons related to transport problems, demanding work commitments and the fact that the residential areas in which Model C schools are located are still fairly homogenous in terms of race. It was recognised that this would change over time as these neighbourhoods became integrated.

It must be noted that many interviewees were conscious that there were serious imbalances in terms of the racial and gender composition of governing bodies. Several interviewees indicated that as vacancies occured in the governing body, these positions were not necessarily filled through an election, but instead by cooption. In some schools this was a strategy used to deliberately correct the race, gender and/or geographical biases and in so doing, make the governing body more representative of the community that the school serves. In one school, the cooption of a Black parent onto the governing body led to the resignation of another member:

> *From a governing body point of view it caused quite a ruffle of the feathers. We had a resignation. He wasn't able to sit next to a black man on the same governing body. So it has been a learning curve for all of us...*

It is also a matter of some concern that some of the teachers interviewed did not know who was on their school governing body, or knew only some of their names. This is ironic because many teachers expressed the perception that parents did not appear to care about what happened at the school.

Lastly, the interviews revealed that between the principal, a teacher and a representative of the governing body at one school, there were sometimes divergent perceptions about the governing body. For example, at one school the principal was unequivocal that the governing body did not reflect the socio-economic profile of the learners, the teacher from the same school was uncertain, while the governing body representative claimed that the governing body was representative.

It can therefore be concluded that although there may be close cooperation between the principal and the governing body, a lack of contact between teachers and the governing body is clearly evident.

4.2.5 Powers of governing bodies compared to the previous regime

There was general agreement among the respondents that the present governing bodies had more powers than their predecessors, who only had advisory powers. However, at least four principals made observations that indicated a discrepancy between the governing body having these powers and practicing them, although this clearly varied from school to school depending on the circumstances and individuals involved. In some cases, the power of governing bodies was perceived by principals to be a threat to their authority and domain in the running of the school.

> *...they definitely have more powers, we all know that ... they just leave it to me which is just lucky for me... in some other Model C schools they have interfered... they do a lot more investigating as to how the money is spent... [but at this school] they are very supportive, they give me the go ahead and I have been lucky.*
>
> *I don't think that they do have much power. I've been in a very fortunate position...*

Despite the fact that the powers of Model C governing bodies are legislated, some principals appeared to restrict the extent to which their governing bodies exercised their powers:

> *I am a firm believer in the fact that your governing body has as much power as the principal gives it in practice and I believe that you can get into a very, very dangerous situation if you keep telling your governing body 'you are powerful, you are powerful'. ... I do not believe that parents actually have all the power that is supposedly given to them ... it's the power within the limitations of what the principal gives them.*

(The teacher interviewed at this school gave a more sympathetic interpretation of the relationship between the principal and governing body when she stated that members of the governing body 'really rely on the leadership of the headmistress'.)

One principal referred to the rapport that was necessary for the smooth running of the school and which gave effect to the cooperation between the governing body and the management committee:

> *I don't think any choice or decision has ever been made that has affected performance in the classrooms without the support of the management team. When [the management team] decided to abolish corporal punishment two years ago, it was a governing body decision. They had to make the decision, but had we not backed it, had I not backed it, I don't think it would have been implemented. So it has been a very healthy rapport between the governing body and the school.*

The experience of the school in the extract above differs markedly with that below, confirming our observation that the interaction between the governing body and the school's management varies from one school to another and that different stakeholders in the school have very different perceptions of each other. In this school, the principal indicated that the governing body was barely functioning, while the chairperson of the governing body contradicted this perspective:

> Principal: *Our governing body is not very operational. They have handed everything basically over to me, even in the expulsions and kickings-out of the school. All I have to do is to tell them. That's it. So it is as if the governing body doesn't exist. It's very much a sleeping partner.*

> Chairperson: *The governing body has got more punch than in the past. ... Even with regard to the headmaster, if they've got any major decisions to make, it has to go through the governing body, ...the school is virtually run by the governing body.*

The perceptions of teachers concerning the increase in the powers of the governing body reveals the tension in power relations between the governing body on one hand and the school management team, principal and the professional staff on the other:

> *They can reverse a decision that is made by the headmaster which I feel is wrong. They're probably having too much power in that respect.*
>
> *We haven't been influenced in the classroom by their power yet.*
>
> *We never used to hear their opinions so much, whereas now, we hear more or less. Things have to go through them as well, so we know that there is a big body there also.*

The response of one teacher indicates that some schools have succeeded in involving the professional staff in decisions made by the governing body. This has led to positive perceptions of the increased powers of governing bodies and an acceptance that the governing body does not necessarily threaten the role of the principal:

> *They're part of the decision-making process. Nobody really tells us what we have to do. ... If they have a management meeting they will sort out various issues that they want us to report back on, and then we break into smaller groups in the afternoon - the last period after school is used for this sort of thing - and then we discuss issues that come out of that. We had a situation at the beginning of the year where ... teachers at the bottom were unhappy. It went all the way up through the different channels ... It's [become] very much a sort-of community thing. ... It is the way education is going, the way trends are going.*

Support for the scope of the governing body's legislated powers was not consistently endorsed. One teacher commented:

> *They can reverse a decision that is made by the headmaster which I feel is wrong. ... You can tell [that they have more power now than in the past] because of the decisions that are made and changed by them.*

A member of a governing body indicated that the increased powers had also had a negative impact by acting as a deterrent to those parents who would have served in a similar capacity in the past:

> *There are some people who are not prepared to serve on these bodies any more because of the higher responsibility that they've got to accept. Not generally only, but in particular, in respect of possible financial obligations, because the governing bodies are liable for a lot of things they weren't liable for [in the past].*

The following were among the examples given by interviewees to illustrate the formidable powers wielded by governing bodies as autonomous and executive institutional governance structures. One parent likened these responsibilities to making the school a 'viable business'.

- They have total control over school finances, including the signing of cheques.
- They determine the character or ethos of the school by approving which staff are appointed.
- They have a legal right to compel parents to pay school fees.
- They can unilaterally introduce innovations in schools without the consent of the department of education.
- They have the final say in disciplinary matters.
- They can interview, select, hire and fire staff members.
- They own school property/buildings subject to a reversionary clause, that is, where school property/buildings are no longer used for educational purposes, ownership reverts to the state.
- They can sue or be sued.
- They control the use of school facilities and grounds.
- They can determine extra-curricula activities, including sporting and cultural events.

4.2.6 Training and capacity building

Interviewees were asked if, in the light of their experiences and the likelihood that governing bodies would be established as part of government policy for all South African schools, there was a need for governing bodies to undergo any form of training in order to enhance their capacity to perform their functions effectively and efficiently.

Of the six schools at which the 16 interviews were held, 10 interviewees were of the opinion that members of governing bodies needed training and capacity building in order to operate efficiently and effectively. Two interviewees (from the same school) did not agree that any training was needed, three did not answer the question and one responded with uncertainty.

Some respondents recommended that training should be organised by the department in partnership with non-government organisations and could take the form of seminars or week-long 'bos beraads'. Such training, in the form of workshops, would be more efficient than the current system where:

> *...a large part of your actual input at meetings is to actually educate them. For example, they are responsible for things like signed leave forms for teachers. Their knowledge of those sort of conditions [of service] is quite limited, so you ... spend a great deal of your time explaining educational policy to them. So I think workshops would be a good idea.*

The content of training should provide information about the general functions and responsibilities of governing bodies as well as skills in specialised areas such as financial management, school organisation, legal aspects of schooling and conflict management. There were two common motivations for training. Firstly, respondents felt that a lot of parents were elected onto governing bodies simply out of interest for their own children's education, without knowing much about running a school. One teacher interviewee stated that:

> *...a lot of parents, just out of interest for their children, go onto the board, but actually know nothing about the mechanics of running a school, how education works and just probably have misconceptions about the whole thing.*

A chairperson of a governing body argued persuasively from an experiential perspective for some form of training for all members, regardless of their skills:

> *I wouldn't have liked to have learnt the hard way like I did. ... It would be nice, because sometimes a parent might come [onto the governing body] and they might be very good at their work, or very good as a mother or father, but still need a bit of expansion on what is required...*

The second argument for training was that once members of governing bodies understood their responsibilities, unnecessary interference in professional matters would be minimised:

> *It is important that they know where their limitations are ... They can make recommendations academically, but they cannot make decisions regarding teachers or syllabus or things like that... they do need to know where their powers start and finish.*

One interviewee from a governing body indicated that the present formulation of Model C governance powers and functions was new and had not been encountered in the past. This was therefore cited as a reason for some form of training.

Another advantage in such training programmes was related to attitudinal changes. It was felt that the process of undergoing training would build collegiality between the representatives of the professional staff and the governing body.

The only principal who did not see the need for training, did, however, see the value of seminars to address specific issues such as the Labour Relations Act and to brief members of the governing body about their responsibilities. In essence, we found there was support for some form of training even where members of the governing bodies were professional people, in order to share knowledge and understanding on school organisation and development.

Implementing a training programme for members of governing bodies implies that there will be resources to develop programme materials, finances to employ the people to provide the training and that governing bodies will have the time to attend these workshops and courses. One parent interviewee expressed scepticism that such resources would be available and suggested that instead, greater care should be exercised by voters when nominees are elected to the governing body so that members are selected on the basis of the skills they bring with them.

Although an overwhelming number of respondents were positive about the need for training, this support was generally articulated within the context of the need for legal and financial skills. None of the interviewees linked training with an ability to function more democratically, inclusively and more effectively. The desire for technical skills always overshadowed issues relating to how schools and their governance structures could be democratised and made more accountable to their constituency.

4.2.7 Accountability of governing bodies

Interviewees were asked to comment on the level and form of accountability which the governing body has to its constituency, i.e. the parents, and to the department of education. An analysis of the interviews indicates that governing bodies have had some unpleasant experiences which they associate with accountability:

> *A lot of rumours fly around and all sorts of incredible stories come back to you about what's happening or what's not happening... At the last general meeting that we had, out of a school of nearly 1300 children, we had 53 parents. The apathy and the lack of interest when it actually comes to people coming and having their say and hearing the story is very sad ... and there are people who live within a kilometre of the school who never, ever set foot in the school, but they moan like anything.*

Accountability was also equated with being trustworthy and acting as custodians or 'good stewards' of resources and performing their functions successfully.

> *...I fully accept that I am accountable, and one has to be able to justify expenditure, etc.*

Few of the respondents readily saw accountability as related to transparency with regard to decision-making and information and formal communication links with the constituency that elected them or with the educational authorities that administer the school.

Three of the five teachers interviewed were not aware of any form of accountability to parents and the department on the part of the governing body. This did not appear to be a concern because members of the governing body were 'first class people'. However, one teacher admitted to a similar apathy and disinterest that was said to characterise parents when she said that 'if I wanted to find out, I could, but I've never bothered'.

a) Parent community

On the question of accountability to the parent community, several observations have emerged.

Firstly, there were cases where no real accountability existed. This state of affairs arose at schools in which governing bodies had not been elected by parents because there was no quorum at the AGM or because the governing body was constituted of volunteer parents:

> *There have been no incidents since I have been here [as principal] in which the governing body has shown any real accountability to the parents, who, by the way, didn't elect them because there wasn't a quorum to elect them. So not ever having a quorum to be elected, the constitution in those days indicated that after seven days you could call another meeting and elect them without [having a quorum]. Those 12 arrived, so they were on the committee.*

In these schools the necessity for accountability was not greatly understood. Also, without exception, regular report-back meetings were not considered to be a viable mechanism for facilitating communication links between the governing body and parents. It was alleged that the parent community in general, was apathetic and had no interest in the on-going affairs of the school and governing body.

Secondly, annual general meetings (AGMs) appeared to be the only form of regular and structured contact between the governing body and parents. AGMs took place in every school. Respondents felt that some degree of accountability only occurred during AGMs when annual reports were scrutinised by the parents. However, this form of accountability is extremely limited in that it permits very little opportunity for parents to participate in discussing substantive issues of school policy and instead much time is spent probing the financial affairs of the school. To this end, financial statements and budgets were made available for scrutiny and discussion.

Thirdly, after the AGM, the second most common accountability mechanism was found to be the school newsletter. Five of the six schools had some form of newsletter. In some schools this was issued by the governing body after their monthly meeting:

> *...one of the members - a different one each time, it is done on a rotational basis - will write a letter which is based on the minutes of the meeting. It goes out and is circularised to all the parents so that they all know what's going on, to try and keep in contact...*

In other schools however, information reached parents via the principal who communicated with them through irregular school newsletters as and when s/he felt the need.

Fourthly, accountability was found to occur on an *ad hoc* and unstructured basis. This took the form of parents' forums and irregular meetings which were called to discuss important issues as they arose, such as the call by some organisations to disband Model C schools. In addition, many of the respondents believed that governing bodies were fulfiling their obligation to be accountable when they made themselves available to the parent body on occasions such as school social and promotional events:

> *They're very good about attending functions and you'll see them talking to parents and you'll know the parents are actually asking them [about governing body decisions]. I had an open day for new parents ... and all the governing body were there. Every member of the governing body took a group around the school. I could hear them answering questions that five years ago [the former] management council couldn't have done.*

In general, what emerged clearly from the interviews was that the level of accountability to parents was low, *ad hoc* and unstructured. In many instances principals were simply informing the governing body of decisions taken. In other cases, depending on the availability of the chairperson of a governing body, school management was being dominated by the principal and the chairperson. Lastly, we found that democratic elections of governing bodies were not taken seriously in some schools.

b) Education department

Accountability to the department was negligible and limited to the extent that governing bodies were obliged to report to the Head of Education in respect of how school funds had been utilised and such a report should be in the form of an audited financial statement. Apart from this type of responsibility, the governing bodies are only indirectly accountable to the education authorities to ensure that the employment and payment of teachers conforms to an agreed upon standard/formula. Otherwise governing bodies are completely autonomous:

> *We have very little to do with the Department. We get very little support from the Department, we get very little direction from the Department and to be honest with you, we have nothing to do with the Department. ... [The governing body] has just done R40 000 worth of building alterations. I never told anybody, I just did it. Nobody will know that I've knocked a door in there, put a hatch in there. And if I had to ask permission [from the Department], I would have waited for the next ten years when [we] couldn't have afforded it.*

4.2.8 Parents participation in relation to financial contribution

One of the distinguishing features of the Model C school system is that parents pay compulsory fees for their children's tuition. Governing bodies have the power to take legal action against parents who do not comply with the compulsory fee payment.

Similar to assumptions in the expression about governance entitlements 'more pay more say', there are also assumptions that because parents are making greater financial contributions they are more involved in school activities. On the basis of first-hand experiences, interviewees were asked to give an assessment of this assumption.

Our findings indicate that there is no consistent correlation between increased financial contributions and parental participation at Model C schools. The level of participation appears to differ from school to school. Of the 16 interviewees, eight agreed that parents were now more involved and interested in school activities and seven disagreed. Two extracts vividly illustrate the two perspectives:

> *...the school's pillars were becoming very dirty. We could've employed contractors to paint which would've been very expensive. But on their own initiative, the parents, having sought the proper advice, offered to do the job. So parents are fully involved with the school: physically, morally and financially.*
>
> *[Greater parental involvement] is debatable, it's very debatable. On a social evening: parents are there to support? Not really, not really. [Their attitude is] 'I'm paying you to educate my child, do it!'*

However, of those who stated that parental participation was now more apparent in the school, this was most frequently attributed to financial commitment:

> *...they're feeling it in a monetary way so they feel obliged to pay some attention...*
>
> *...they like to know how their money's being used...*
>
> *...they now have a vested interest, they have a stake in the school. ... [parents] want to know they're getting their money's worth. So for the school fees they pay, they want to see what you give them for that in return.*

Where the level of participation had improved quite significantly after becoming a Model C school, this was brought about by the realisation among parents that to secure quality education for their children, they needed to contribute, not just monetarily, but also in terms of supporting all school activities, amongst others, fund raising for the school and taking an interest in their child's progress by supporting teachers. The following were given as examples of activities which showed an improvement in levels of participation:

- parents evenings and annual sporting and cultural events;
- an increase in the number of appointments with principals and members of governing bodies regarding the general progress at school or to query certain misunderstandings;

- constant monitoring of children's academic progress through interaction with the teachers;
- school building construction, maintenance, repairs and alterations;
- donations and voluntary service.

Those interviewees who were of the opinion that parents were no more involved in school activities than before, stated that it was always the same parents who took an active interest in the affairs of the school, attended school functions and volunteered either to fund raise for the school or help whenever necessary.

It was clear from the interviews that even when parents were not more involved, they nevertheless appeared to have greater expectations than in the past that the school would meet their child's educational needs.

> *...with the compulsory fees, they are now expecting a better deal. ... But participation in decision-making and participation and involvement in the general activities of the school, it hasn't changed.*

At three schools the principals and members of the governing body expressed differing opinions on the matter of increased participation. For example, in one primary school the principal stated that he could not detect a difference from the years prior to the school becoming Model C. To illustrate this he argued that he was responsible for approximately 90% of the current decisions in the school. On the other hand, the member of the governing body listed several ways in which parents interacted with the governing body and voluntarily enhanced the material resources of the school:

> *Apart from the AGMs, we have people writing letters [to the school] and we have people making appointments with the governing body or a sub-committee ... to query things or to make sure that money is put to good use. We have parents offering their services on an on-going basis to do things for the school. We have parents who are building contractors who built a wall at the school, one provided a braai area and braai-place paving, repairs to the school buildings, all kinds of things, donations of equipment, you name it. ... They say it is their school.*

Such differences of opinion indicate that the notion of parental participation in a school and expectations in that regard may be interpreted and perceived differently by different role players.

4.2.9 Stakeholders to be represented on the governing body

At the time of this investigation, the governing body of a particular Model C school could only have elected representatives of parents or guardians whose children attend that school. Other members could be coopted by the governing body and the principal attends governing body meetings in an ex-officio capacity. Since the mid-1980s, there have been campaigns calling for the introduction of governance structures such as

PTSAs which would include representatives of other relevant stakeholders. Although these campaigns were most active in African, Coloured and Indian schools, the notion that governing bodies should include other stakeholders has recently been given much more serious consideration by decision-makers and the education authorities. The extent of this is evident from the provision in the GNU's White Paper on Education and Training, which states all schools should have governing bodies and that their composition should be inclusive of 'the main stakeholders in the school' (1995c:70).

On the understanding that such government policies were in the offing, this study needed to ascertain the level of support at Model C schools for broadening the composition of the governing body to include other stakeholders. In addition, we wanted to understand how principals, teachers and parents defined 'the main stakeholders in the school'.

i. Parents

There was no contestation or argument about parent representation on the governing body because this was seen to be the largest interest group and stakeholder in the school and all interviewees were already accustomed to parents as the status quo in governing bodies. The definition of the parent constituency was not raised or contested (unlike the findings of the stakeholder interviews above).

ii. Students

None of the interviewees from the three primary schools in this investigation were in favour of primary school learners having representation on the governing body.

> *...it means the physical involvement of children in school management, involving a 12 or 13 year old who has no idea of financial and administrative management. They'd be out of their depth.*

Nevertheless, all principals at these schools saw the value of consulting with the learners on certain matters and on maintaining an open-door practice for any student who may wish to discuss a matter with the principal or governing body.

> *I have regular meetings with my pupil body so that they can express their needs in this school. If their need is of such a nature that I feel it should be discussed with the governing body, I do that.*

There were mixed responses in respect of the representation of students at secondary school level. Some interviewees felt that to have students on the governing body was undesirable. This view is aptly expressed by a member of a governing body:

> *Something which I personally have a problem with is students trying to rule the institution which they run (sic)... They are there to learn, and they are there to obey the rules which are laid down by the controlling body of that institution. That might sound undemocratic, but that's the way it is. I don't think there's any place really for pupils on the governing body handling a budget of one-and-half million rand a year.*

Although this extract does not specifically refer to Black students, it suggests, together with the following quotation, that the governance problems experienced at some African secondary schools are having a negative impact on attitudes and giving rise to apprehension or even rejection of student representation on governing bodies:

> *...traditionally in the Black schools the pupils are older. They are up to 23 [years of age] so they are adults, and ... many of them have taken over the school...*

Voting rights for student representatives were vehemently rejected by a teacher:

> *I would not have a problem with them having representation. ... I would have a problem with students voting on that body because ... they cannot vote [in elections for government] ... If they are allowed to vote then they must be responsible for their voting, and I don't think they are ready for that kind of responsibility. I don't mind them having their say and being heard.*

However, interviewees averred that it was critical to consult students through the prefect system and/or students' representative council - at least one of which existed in all the secondary schools of the sample - on problems for consideration by the governing bodies. Others felt that it was extremely important to include students at secondary level because they were mature enough to meaningfully and effectively contribute to the development of school policies. One principal indicated that the various strategies he had pursued in this regard had, however, been unsuccessful as a result of the negative response from parents:

> *We also had the HOD who is in charge of the Students' Representative Council. He was coming to represent the students. And this governing body told him to get out of it. They weren't interested in that. This was a parent body and that was that. ... I did invite the chairman of the SRC - chairperson - to come along, but I thought I'd get permission first [from the governing body]. They were adamant, they didn't want anything to do with him.*

One interviewee was already considering the implications for both transition and tradition and the desirability of learner participation in governance in the future:

> *...we are going to have to certainly educate pupils to take a more leading role and it is very hard in the traditional schools that have been going on for a long time. ... [It] is going to be very important down the track, to have pupil representation. Some schools have done a big strategic planning exercise, a really extensive and very expensive one, and I asked 'Did you have kids on there?' and they said 'No'. I think that is a great pity.*

iii. Teachers

In respect of teacher representation on the governing body, one principal maintained that teachers or the broader staff, including laboratory technicians, cleaners and clerical staff, were sufficiently represented through the principal. This minority view was not supported by any of the teachers. However, one member of a governing body argued that the governance of schools was essentially a matter for parents because it is the parents who pay for their children's schooling. If teachers were represented on the governing body, the interviewee predicted that 'there would be opposition to it'. It was also said that teachers had their own sphere of operation, namely professional matters, where parents had no say.

Contrasting with this was a strongly supported view that teachers, including other categories of staff, are important components of school governance, therefore their non-participation in the present governing bodies was a serious omission which had to be corrected. One teacher felt that the role which teachers played in schools was sufficient justification for their participation in governance:

> *Yes, the staff needs representation because basically we do more work and everyone else is making all the decisions. So [teachers] feel like [they're] doing the work for somebody else's decisions and [they've] got no part in it.*

One principal added that situations could arise in which principals might simply represent their own narrow interests. The involvement of teachers would circumvent this tendency:

> *I suppose if you had a dictatorial type of principal who made the decisions and said that that goes for his teachers, then I believe you would need representation...*

It was also found that the principal's ex-officio status, i.e. no voting rights, was not an issue at any of the schools. Decisions at governing body meetings were either taken by consensus or the technicality over voting rights was ignored.

iv. Other stakeholders

On the question of whether other categories of stakeholders should be involved, the dominant view seemed to favour only the participation of parents, teachers and students (the latter at secondary level) to be involved in school governing bodies. However, some interviewees were positive about representation for other stakeholders. Although there was not complete and consistent agreement on these stakeholders, the following were mentioned during interviews:

- Local business leaders, especially if they made significant and on-going financial contributions to the school; One interviewee argued that businesses should only have representation at local level and not be limited to supporting individual schools;
- Local authorities;
- Community and residents' associations, although it was mentioned that there could be problems in identifying and selecting these interest groups;

88

- Religious leaders;
- Representatives from the education department.

One principal passed a remark about parents which supports the argument that the composition of governing bodies must include a broader range of stakeholders if schools are to be responsive and proactive in facing future challenges:

> *...[exercising greater freedom] certainly was not encouraged by the parents, because they are very conservative themselves and they don't want anything to change and the school must be the same, and uniform and the hats and so on.*

4.2.10 Should representation by stakeholders be obligatory or optional?

Of the respondents who answered this question, the general response (including those who did not support representation for teachers and students (at secondary schools) was that it should be obligatory for parents, teachers and students to play a role on governing bodies. There was a feeling though that parents should have greater representation because they were paying fees.

Secondly, there was agreement that participation for other stakeholders should be optional. The rationale for this was that, by virtue of their employment and as members of civil society organisations, parents were effectively representing these stakeholders. It was argued that for people who are not familiar with school issues, attending governing body meetings would bore them. Further, it was argued that although some stakeholders, such as the business sector, would like to be represented, it was impractical because of their other more pressing engagements.

4.2.11 Elitism

It is frequently alleged (as indicated earlier), that Model C schools were introduced by the former white minority government as a device to protect, insulate and perpetuate privileges enjoyed by the minority elite. It is logical to assume that this strategy was premised on the recognition that majority interests would be dominant in a future South Africa and that the public schooling system would increasingly be characterised by an egalitarian sharing of resources. As a result of the widely held perception that Model C schools are elitist, some interest groups had, in the past, called for their demise. This investigation wanted the interviewees to respond to the allegation that Model C schools are elitist and to find out if they perceived there to be any substance to this perspective.

A dictionary definition states that *elitism* is 'advocacy of or reliance on leadership or dominance by a select group'. The notions of selectivity and dominance carry negative social connotations related to discrimination and are therefore emotionally charged. This was evident during interviews, when the term *elitist* was rejected in favour of *privileged* or *quality*. Therefore interviewers frequently used the terms *elitist* and *privileged* interchangably.

Regardless of their agreement with or rejection of the allegation, the tone of the interviewees' responses was defensive, giving reasons to justify the conditions that characterised Model C schools. A member of a governing body even felt it necessary to dissociate herself personally from any culpability by saying 'I never made the rules for the country'.

Among the nine interviewees from high schools, there was greater agreement than disagreement that Model C schools are elitist. Only one interviewee (a teacher) was adamant that they were not elitist, while another (a prinicipal from a different school) gave an ambivalent response. Three of the seven interviewees from primary schools denied that Model C schools were elitist, with one interviewee adopting an ambivalent position.

The charge of elitism was seen by some respondents as inappropriate if it implied that they were discriminatory. The notion of selection was not considered to be a discriminatory measure:

> *...I wonder if 'elitist' is the correct term, perhaps 'privileged', because they are of a particular history... Elitism is where you select your pupils. As far as I am concerned, you select the best in all respects, children coming from wealthy homes, children who are intellectually privileged.*

Some respondents indicated that selection for admission to the school was based on the following criteria, not all of which were used in every school:

- residing in the school feeder area
- age
- language competency
- affordability

Other respondents, while admitting that Model C schools are elitist, stressed that that should not be misconstrued as racism.

> *...Model C, by definition, are fee-paying schools. They have facilities far better than some of the other schools, and people who want to attend them do have to pay to extra fees...But by that, they are not racist.*

In those interviews where the charge of elitism was accepted, the following characteristics were cited in support of the charge:

- well-resourced educational and sporting facilities;
- educational standards, e.g. class sizes, emphasis on an academic curriculum;

- funding through the compulsory fee system permits some independent decision-making and employment of additional staff;
- affordability of the compulsory fee acts as a self-restricting admission policy;
- levels of parental participation in governance are greater than other models.
- admissions criteria ensure a level of selectivity;
- racial composition of learners is still predominantly white.

Assumptions around the notions of elitism and privilege were challenged by one principal:

> *Our school is well equipped but it is very ordinary [although] not compared to the schools in the townships. But we are not so posh and wonderful. We do not have an oak panelled office and all those kind of things. We keep that to a minimum. We spend all the money that we get on the kids.*

Although one principal claimed that 'all the children in our country have the privilege now' to choose to attend a Model C school, this was quickly qualified by 'all the children that can afford it'. Another principal argued forcefully that Model C schools were making a difference in the lives of formerly disadvantaged learners and were offering a form of education which was desirable among Black families:

> *Some Model C schools have worked very hard at giving disadvantaged pupils a really advantaged start, so that I see a school like this ... providing all children, but particularly black children, with a chance to get an education which perhaps they would not have had otherwise - for various reasons. ...what Black parents are looking for is not an elitist school at all. They want a school where people are teaching ... they want responsible teaching. They are not interested in whether the kids have got a lab or an OHP. To them that does not mean a thing. They want to know that their kids are being taught properly.*

Although it is arguable whether one white principal can know what is wanted by the majority of black parents, the above extract implies that the future of these schools depends on the extent to which these schools prioritise, and are able to satisfy, the educational expectations and aspirations of black learners and their parents.

In most interviews it was argued that Model C schools could be defined as *unavoidably* elitist or privileged (as some respondents preferred to classify them). Interviewees stated that Model C schools were increasingly becoming economically unaffordable and inaccessible to the majority of deserving students - both black and white.

Some respondents came to the defence of this elitism of Model C schools on the basis that parents have a democratic right to choose where their children receive their education in accordance with how much they can afford. Further, it was argued that

Model C type schools were ideal for the future because the pressure to maintain high academic standards would mean that government would be required to contribute more money which it cannot afford. In that event it would be better to let parents pay for schooling and ease this burden on the state.

Finally, there was the viewpoint that, despite the problems of elitism, the existence of privileged schools is a norm of society:

> *...wherever you go in the world, you are going to get some schools that are going to be better or more elite than others.*

One interviewee felt that it was unfair and too early to criticise Model C schools because the transition to non-racialism had only recently begun and learners attending these schools were 'the first generation of the new democratic society'.

Refuting the charge of elitism and privilege, one principal stated that the education offered at Model C schools is:

> *the education that all children in this country should have, and ... what the other schools should be aiming at.*

In referring to the facilities at Model C schools as 'trappings of success', she added that:

> *...they don't actually make a difference to the nitty gritty of the education in the classroom ... we are [only] trying as far as we can to maintain standards that have been built up over the years, and this is where the vast majority of schools in South Africa would like to be.*

Such dismissive comments about the good facilities at Model C schools, implying that they do not contribute to quality learning and 'good teaching', suggest that the respondents were ignorant of the way in which schools servicing disadvantaged communities lacked the most basic amenities (such as toilets, running water, electricity, windows, lockable doors and fencing) and how these neglected conditions and hardships related to the breakdown in the culture of learning.

Finally, it is evident that respondents so equated Model C 'standards' with quality education, that some felt compelled to endorse and justify the compulsory school fee system although it underpinned forms of discrimination and exclusivity within a public school.

4.2.12 Fears and concerns about the future of Model C schools

We anticipated that the principals, teachers and governing bodies of Model C schools were aware of the criticisms ranged against this model through the media and it was evident from the emotional responses in the media that this was leading to high levels of anxiety. Interviewees were therefore asked to name their fears and concerns about the future of Model C schools so that this study could uncover the predominant issues that would require serious consideration by those responsible for the restructuring of schools in South Africa.

Only 4 of the 16 interviewees stated confidently that they had no fears and concerns for the future. Of these, there was only one principal, who described her school as a 'safe haven in an ever-changing world' and only one teacher who, as a self-proclaimed optimist, believed that 'all teachers are ready for changes or even bigger changes than we have [now]'.

A member of a governing body ascribed the reactions of fear and concern to the way in which the media were handling the issue of Model C schools:

> *...what I read in the paper - it annoys and upsets me ... because of the ignorance, that the editors of these papers allow them to print such rubbish sometimes. [When] Mr Bengu says a statement, it's either blown up or it's distorted out of context.*

The majority of respondents expressed concerns rather than fears. Firstly, there was a concern that Model C schools were established during the apartheid era and therefore that they still carry baggage from the past, regardless of the great strides that some of the schools have made to break with this inheritance. For example, many schools had introduced flexible admission policies, ways to respond to the needs of low academic performers and funding mechanisms for those who could not afford to pay the compulsory school fees. However, this concern with the origins of the model was linked by some respondents to a claim that some Model C schools were still practising and imparting apartheid values. This phenomenon was seen to threaten all Model C schools:

> *...the other Model C schools in the country that are not admitting children of all races, if Model C schools go, it will be because of them.*

Secondly, there was no trust in decision-makers. It was feared that politicians would interfere in school matters and their decisions would be shortsighted and based largely on political point scoring rather than sound educational reasons:

> *...politicians play an important role in decision-making concerning Model C schools, which is unfair. [They] want to link Model C schools to an apartheid era framework because they were established during the apartheid era. ... Model C schools are seen from a political viewpoint only and not from an educational [one]. ... People want to see a monster in the Model C plan and they don't want to look further and consider its educational values.*

This respondent felt that regardless of the legitimate claims which some people were voicing, the fact remained that Model C schools, by virtue of their low enrolment capacity, would not be a panacea to cure the ills of the entire education system.

Thirdly, several respondents stated that they would be loathe to see the demise and scrapping of this model as it was presently constituted. There was no attachment to the name but systemic characteristics, especially those related to the financial powers of governing bodies and teacher-pupil ratios, were the most feared changes because of their link to quality teaching and learning. One of the characteristics which was valued by some respondents was their autonomy and the minimal level of control exercised by the education authorities. It was feared that changes might see the re-emergence of an 'interfering' bureaucracy and the erosion of the powers enjoyed by governing bodies. A few interviewees also felt that, in the face of the enormous need for increased provision of education, the financial contribution from the Model C parent community to these schools was not something that the GNU could afford to change.

Fourthly, there was a concern that standards relevant to the provision of a quality education would drop in the future. When such a statement was probed, it was found to centre on teacher-pupil ratios and pedagogic practices. It was feared that a rise in class sizes would bring about a deterioration of academic standards. In argument for the retention of the current teacher-pupil ratios, it was said that the present classrooms were not big enough to accommodate larger classes. In addition, two teachers mentioned the need for more careful attention to teaching effectiveness especially with Model C schools enrolling increasing numbers of learners from disadvantaged communities and with syllabus pressures. It was said that this care would have to be sacrificed with higher teacher-pupil ratios. The system of retaining smaller classes by teaching two shifts was not an option that was being considered.

Conversely, there was concern that maintaining the lower teacher-pupil ratios that characterise Model C schools and related academic standards, would require a substantial rise in school fees so that additional teachers could be employed by governing bodies. The attendant increase in school fees raised fears about affordability and accessibility, putting these school beyond the reach of the poor. The fear that standards will drop in the future also reveals that interviewees were either unaware of, or disbelieving of the GNU's intention to raise educational standards in all South African schools.

Fifthly, teachers expressed concern about job security. There was apprehension that changes to bring about an equitable distribution of resources in a single education department implied that teachers would be redeployed to areas where their security could not be guaranteed. Although this was a concern which could mask a fear of the unknown and the challenge to venture beyond the security of one's own racial 'boundaries', there was acceptance of redeployment in principle. Nevertheless, teachers indicated that they were prepared to be redeployed to serve the interests of all children, especially in rural areas, in accordance with the new political developments in the country.

Finally, there was concern that a new school dispensation would deny children the right to be taught in the language of their choice and to learn about their own culture and history.

Not all schools expressed negative fears and concerns for the future. In relation to experiences in the recent past, one high school principal was quite positive in his remarks that:

> *...those principals who have kept their schools white, who have kept their schools exclusive, have really missed out on a number of years of experience which I think is vital for our rethinking in education.*

4.2.13 Steps taken to address the fears and concerns

Interviewees were asked if they had taken any pre-emptive steps in relation to their specific fears and concerns. The responses were varied.

One principal indicated that he was adopting a wait and see attitude and was therefore not keen to devise any strategies. Uncertainty about the future appeared to be the main reason. Another respondent also referred to this by saying:

> *...we can't even order [textbooks] for next year because we don't know what the syllabus is going to be.*

A sense of disempowerment, despair and resignation was also expressed by another interviewee,[24] that regardless of the actions taken by the institution, the final outcome would be determined by other decision-makers:

> *...thank God my child is in her matric this year. Look, one understands the aspirations of people but I can see no solution in sight. There are too many people. ... It is generally physically impossible on every level to accommodate what is happening. ... I can't see what you can do about eroding [governance] powers. ... People are so schooled in accepting...*

These despondent interviewees were waiting until firm decisions about the future of Model C schools had been taken by the authorities.

In contrast to the above, other interviewees whose schools were confident about the future had decided to be proactive. These interviewees were in the majority. A number of initiatives were being implemented or were in the process of being developed. These included:

- Pre-emptive strategies: Planning meetings to anticipate likely future actions and to develop possible alternatives were being held. These meetings sometimes involved the management committee and governing body, or, as in one school, the teachers of each subject had been asked to develop a strategic plan.

- Forms of affirmative action: Bursaries would be awarded to deserving students, especially, black pupils. New admission policies to deracialise the pupil intake would be formulated.

- Attitudinal changes: Parents were being encouraged to be positive and to view changes as an essential preparation for broader changes in the education system.

---

[24] These sentiments were more frequently expressed by interviewees in response to the last question about negotiations, as provided for in the Interim Constitution.

- Priorities: Resources would be redirected away from extra-mural activities into payment for extra teachers so that the school could counteract the high teacher-pupils ratios that were anticipated.

- Resources and facilities: Educational materials would be shared with teachers from needy schools. School facilities would be modified to make optimal use of the floor space and accommodate greater numbers of students.

- Alternative teaching methods and flexible teaching arrangments, such as mechanisms to maintain low teacher-pupil ratios were being considered, e.g. shifts and an intermediary or middle school for the grades between primary and senior high school. If teachers were to be asked to take on additional teaching responsibilities, one school indicated that this would jeopardise the sport and cultural activities in the extra-mural programme.

- Retaining compulsory user fees which will provide the school with the financial capacity to employ additional staff.

4.2.14 Negotiations with the government

Section 247(1) of the Interim Constitution protects the powers of existing school governing bodies by stating that the government may only alter the powers of these bodies after having bona fide negotiations with them. The Section does not specify whether such negotiations should be with each individual school or through a centralised bargaining forum. The researchers wanted to uncover the expectations of the interviewees, i.e. whether negotiations would be on an individual or collective basis and to identify the issues that were anticipated to be central to such debates and bargaining. Essentially, the question put to interviewees was of a scenario or what-if nature.

In general, interviewees indicated that they would welcome the opportunity to have negotiations with government about the powers and functions of governing bodies. However, one respondent expressed a sense of powerlessness about the outcome of such negotiations:

> *It will just be a decision that is made. From what we know, it won't be a negotiation. It will be a decision handed down. So we feel very helpless in that respect, that we won't have much say in whether [Model C] goes completely privatised or state-aided.*

Though some respondents preferred negotiations to be conducted with individual governing bodies, there was nevertheless an acceptance that from a practical point of view this would be time consuming and not economically viable. A suggestion that seemed to have the support of all respondents was that a provincial or district forum should be formed to conduct negotiations on behalf of the Model C schools in that geographic area. There was also a strong view that teachers should be represented in those negotiations, because the decisions taken would have a bearing on their working environment.

Only one principal argued strongly for negotiations to be with individual schools. This was based on the premise that each Model C school had responded differently to the new social context and therefore schools could not be treated alike.

> *I don't think that there is one Model C school that is [dealing with accessibility] properly. Some [schools] did tend to become exclusive, while others tended to become inclusive. I would not like [my school] to be numbered with [others].*

This argument calls for evaluations of individual school policies, practices and innovations and assumes that all the issues raised by respondents fall within the scope of Section 247(1) in the Constitution. That this Section only refers to procedural matters, compelling the government to enter into bona fide negotiatians over governing bodies' powers and functions and not other Model C issues, was not clearly understood. For example, teaching methodologies and teacher-pupil ratios are not the responsibility of the governing body. Therefore, there is no constitutional imperative for the government to negotiate such matters with the governing body.

A numbers of issues were identified as possible agenda items for negotiations with the government:

- A new formula for financing schools was isolated as a central item of the negotiations.

- Some respondents wanted the government to transfer school property to them so that they could exercise the option of complete privatisation or independence. However, this was a minority view as most respondents did not contest the right of the state to own Model C schools. These respondents were quite prepared to provide the resources for maintenance as is happening presently. However, the option of going private was seen as counterproductive. Rather, they were keen to make a case for the continued existence of Model C type state-aided schools subject to acceptable and reasonable modifications such as non-discriminatory admission policies.

- Medium of instruction was seen to be an important component of negotiations as some respondents felt that unless parallel medium schools were introduced, minority languages such as Afrikaans faced extinction,

- Access to these schools in terms of admission policies was frequently mentioned as an issue to be negotiated. This would include criteria used to control admissions, such as academic competence, age and affordability.

- The time frame for introducing changes was also identified as a significant agenda item. There was a view that changes would have to be gradual rather than abrupt, to allow adequate scope for adjustments. Dramatic change was perceived to have the potential of damaging the quality of education being provided through these schools. The inclusion of these comments by respondents indicates that change is accepted as being inevitable. Implementation of the changes should be controlled to avoid disruption of learning and teaching.

5. CONCLUSIONS

During the course of this research project (1994-95), South Africa experienced considerable social change, not least of which occurred within the education sector, in particular, in schooling. Important consultations and pronouncements concerning many of the issues central to this research were made by the authorities at both national and provincial levels. In a very real sense, political developments and events have therefore overtaken our findings, thus giving the reader a sense of *deja vu* and calling into question the salience of the research as originally anticipated. Those who are familiar with education policy developments will realise, however, that although these debates have been in circulation for some time,[25] only 'enabling' legislation has been passed on these policy issues and several of the key questions are still unresolved and contested. In our conclusions below, we have honed in on these questions and tried to provide some guidance to their resolution.

Centralisation/Decentralisation

Regardless of what is stated in Schedule 6 and Section 126 of the Interim Constitution in terms of the national and provincial legislative competencies, the centralisation/decentralisation debate on school governance will still remain a contentious issue. Any weakness in the system, be it at central, provincial, regional/district/circuit and school level, is likely to have a bearing on the entire system. Therefore, as long as the matrix of policy is properly identified and responsibilities properly outlined, strong centralisation will benefit from strong decentralisation and vice versa. This means that a call for either decentralisation or centralisation creates an unnecessary dichotomy, as if there was some 'chinese wall' between them.

Furthermore, reasons that are put forward as an argument in favour of either centralisation or decentralisation, lend strong support to the movement beyond the 'either/or' dichotomy. This is because in practice, once the broad objectives and goals of the system have been formulated, the decision as to where different policy and administrative functions are located should not be seen as something sacrosanct or cast in stone. It is something that should be flexible and negotiable. Thus, the problem of educational governance should be conceptualised in terms of the transference of power over specific policy functions to different levels of the system. Naturally, a proper evaluation of the capacity, experience and needs of the system at a particular time is one of the factors which will invariably determine which *modus operandi* will be best suited to the system as a whole.

The second most important reason is that a system which has as its starting point a set of core values and principles which promote democracy, a people-centred and people-driven approach to development, sustainability, accountability, stakeholder participation in decision-making, nation-building, equity, efficiency and effectiveness, would aspire to achieve the following:

---

[25] At the start of 1996, education debates in Britain centred on the issue of selection, admission policies and the principles of access to schooling.

- Promotion of local initiatives;
- Maintenance of coherent norms and standards across the system;
- Redistribution of policy and administrative functions to different levels according to needs and capacity;
- Promotion of a national identity which includes local flexibility;
- Equitable distribution of resources and their optimum, effective and efficient use;
- Elimination of unnecessary bureaucratic red-tape and over-centralisation/decentralisation;
- Provision of a service which balances quantitative and qualitative educational outcomes;
- An integrated planning process feeding on information/data collected at all levels of the system;
- Strong partnerships between the various levels of governance as well as between the state and the different stakeholders.

The previous system, where great power was located primarily at one particular level and within the hands of a few people, no longer exists. The form of people-centred democracy which the GNU is committed to implementing is that which permits all relevant stakeholders to participate on an on-going and daily basis in matters that affect them directly. While this participatory form of democracy must not undermine representative democratic processes and legitimate leaders, it establishes a balance of statutory power-sharing at various levels through a process of consultative and advisory structures. Concerning the provincial level of governance, several reports and legislation[26] have already detailed these and made important contributions to the introduction of such structures as (interim) forums or councils in many provinces. These documents and the implementation of interim provincial structures do not differ significantly from the broad governance proposals expressed by stakeholders during this research. Thus we do not elaborate further on the nature and composition of the provincial level of governance.

---

[26] See documents such as: Implementation Plan for Education and Training (ANC Education Department 1994a); Proposals for the Reconstruction of Education and Training in KwaZulu-Natal (EPU/MEPU, 1994). Legislation includes the Provincial School Education Acts of Gauteng and Mpumalanga.

Intermediary level of governance

A matter of concern is the link between the provincial statutory governance structure and school governing bodies. At least one intermediary level of governance is necessary between the provincial and institutional levels. This is supported by most of the major stakeholders and senior administrators to whom we spoke, although not many had formulated definite ideas on the nature and composition of the governance structure at the regional/district/circuit level.

This intermediary level is significant because governance structures at this level can act as important catalysts in disbanding the apartheid characteristics of our schooling system, developing an ethos that supports a culture of non-racism and nation building, while sharing and/or redeploying resources among schools in geographic proximity to each other. Such structures would also need to interface with both the provincial consultative and advisory body, as well as the school governing bodies within their region/district/circuit boundaries. The principle which has already been established for school governing bodies, i.e. that they should comprise all relevant stakeholders, should be applied here. Thus, stakeholders are likely to include the following groups:

- School governing bodies
- Parent, teacher and student organisations
- Local government
- Education-related community organisations with a presence throughout the district
- Departmental officials (ex-officio)

Primarily, this intermediary level of governance should have communication and liaison functions between the provincial and institutional structures and also perform district planning and development functions. The province's Department of Education will need to provide these structures and, where necessary, their sub-committees, with a secretariat and a financial allocation.

School governance

The institutional level of governance in all South Africa's schools must be transformed if we are to implement participatory democracy at a level of society where it can be experienced daily. While there was complete agreement that no stakeholder wanted to see the closure of Model C schools (almost without exception), all those interest groups that participated in this research, proposed some modification to the way in which these schools were governed and managed. These proposals were made even though it was evident that Model C governing bodies had the most developed and greatest devolution of power of all school statutory structures which were established under the former National Party government.

This fact provides the GNU with useful experiential data and makes a very strong argument that this Model is not wholly desirable for widescale implementation in a democratic South Africa. Other models, such as the non-statutory PTSAs which were established in many African schools, should also inform public debates on this issue. Thus, this research found that there are several positive aspects in the formulation of

Model C governance which can be incorporated in the democratic governance structures of schools and for which there is support among most stakeholders. Examples of decentralised school governance in other countries also indicate that there are positive outcomes to be gained, but care must be taken to ensure the participatory nature of governance so that no one stakeholder is excluded or dominated by another.

In principle, more power should be devolved to democratic school governing bodies. Our research found this principle to be unanimously supported although it should not be inferred that there is complete consensus among stakeholders. On the contrary, there are clear divisions concerning the nature of that power and which powers should reside with governing bodies and which should be retained at either provincial and/or district/local levels. If our educational objectives are to move away from the differentiation of the past and towards greater equality, it is essential that all public schools should have the same governance system. This clearly rates the school governing body as a structure for which the national minister must establish norms and standards.

However, several predictable effects or outcomes of an acceptable and constitutional devolution of power to school level can be mentioned. There will be a decrease in the level of control of educational authorities and an enabling of the school community to exercise a sense of ownership over the institution. In addition, the relevant stakeholders will be able to make a positive and valuable contribution to the development of the whole school, for example, there will be the opportunity for innovation to occur even beyond the academic curriculum and teaching methodology, to include inter alia, cultural programmes, staff development programmes, fund raising, participation in school maintenance and management.

However, our findings are that despite being given certain powers and functions, not all Model C governing bodies and school management teams utilised them, for various reasons. This will certainly be true of school governing bodies as a whole in the future. Thus a flexible and 'permissive' system may be an appropriate approach, so that schools and governing bodies can find their own level of exercising their powers and functions by selecting from a 'menu' of statutory powers and functions for governing bodies. Such a menu should include user fees and fund raising, as well as management of finances because of the way in which these functions relate to an increased sense of ownership and qualitative improvements in teaching and learning resources.

Composition of governing bodies

The governing body should comprise representatives of the relevant stakeholders in the school. This is already the policy of the GNU (DoE, 1995c:70) and contrasts with past structures which comprised parents and the (ex-officio) principal. Three distinct groups are easily identified. Firstly, parents of the learners attending the school should be represented. Within the South African context of migrant workers, rural families and single parents, it is essential to adopt a broad interpretation of the category of parents by including *de facto* guardians, such as grandparents, other relatives and neighbours who may be responsible for the learner. Secondly, the governing body should have representatives of the staff employed at the school. This category should be interpreted broadly to include administrative, technical and maintenance staff, in addition to the teaching staff.

Thirdly, at secondary schools,[27] students should have representation on the governing body. The issue of whether secondary school learners should be involved in all the governing body's decision-making is contentious. While some stakeholders may not support their participation in every discussion and decision, it is essential and necessary for student representatives to participate in decisions which they have to implement and when they are responsible for outcomes. Indeed, this involvement would be consistent with the United Nations' Convention on the Rights of Children. Lastly, provision must be made for the governing body to coopt additional individuals (e.g. for their skills) or representatives of other interest groups, such as sponsors. However, such cooption should have the support of all stakeholders in the governing body.

This inclusive approach to the composition of the governing body is essential for the practice of participatory democracy and to encourage a sense of ownership and commitment to school development among all the relevant stakeholders. Furthermore, it will reduce, if not eradicate, the lack of confidence in governing bodies which some stakeholders appear to have. Some critics maintain that the inclusion of certain stakeholders, e.g. students, is a recipe for conflict in schools. However, we would argue that a tension in the balance of power can have positive outcomes such as ensuring greater accountability, transparency and involvement in the activities of the school.

Accountability

The representative nature of stakeholder nominees needs to be stressed in order to ensure the level of awareness and understanding concerning the importance of accountability to the stakeholders they represent. Structured and regular mechanisms of accountability need to be developed in agreement with the full body of stakeholders so that these mechanisms meet with stakeholder expectations. Such discussions could occur during a general meeting.

Electoral system

The process by which representatives of stakeholders are elected onto governing bodies needs careful consideration. That used by Model C schools is inadequate because it was found to tap largely the motivated and committed professionals within the parent body, inevitably a small group. Although it is desirable to have skilled and experienced governors, mechanisms must be introduced into electoral procedures for the electorate to consider issues of race and gender so that poorly resourced, under-skilled and disadvantaged individuals (e.g. single mothers) will be encouraged and more willing to participate in school governance. The experiences of other developing countries such as Brazil and Papua New Guinea are important lessons in this regard. Provision of transport stipends, child care services, re-scheduling of meetings and capacity building programmes will be important forms of affirmative action to encourage greater participation. Since many groups within our society do not have experience in school governance, prior to elections it may be necessary to have a campaign to demystify governing bodies, their powers and functions, practices and procedures.

---

[27] At primary school learners are unlikely to have the capacity to participate equally with other stakeholders in the discussions and decision-making of the governing body. however, it would be desirable for these learners to be consulted when they are to be directly affected by decisions of the governing body.

School development

The governing body must be involved in the development of the school so that qualitative improvements in teaching and learning can occur. This implies that, together with the department, the school community will share responsibility for the allocation and maintenance of resources at the school.

Admission policies

The issue of whether school governing bodies should have power over admission policy and be able to charge compulsory user fees, has been overtaken by events. For example, subsequent to the interviews of this research project, at the start of the 1995 academic year schools were clearly aware that admission policies must comply with the new national Constitution and that past discriminatory practices had to cease. Admission policies in public schools is a public matter and should therefore not be a responsibility of the governing body but of the provincial education department.

Academic competence

This is another issue which is used in the defence of exclusionary school admission policies. As with the compulsory user fees, the constitutional right of the individual to basic education must be invoked. At a public school, academic competence, unless this involves special education needs, cannot be considered as an exclusionary criterion for enrolment.

Employment of teachers

Power to employ extra teachers over and above their departmental allocation has been exercised by many Model C governing bodies. Although many of the interviewees indicated that this power was greatly valued, especially in their attempts to offset the raising of their teacher-pupil ratios, this solution is not acceptable to many if it is premised on the right to charge compulsory user fees (and implies exclusion on the basis of affordability). The employment of extra teachers by a school undermines the responsibility of the state to provide teachers in public schools. At public schools, it is desirable that all employees should have the same employer. This will avoid individual teachers having a conflict of interests in the performance of their duties and will also enable collective bargaining at an industrial relations level, which is in the interests of both the employer and employee. One possibility for overcoming such problems while still allowing schools to employ more teachers would be for the school to provide the state with the financial resources to employ extra teachers at their schools.

Language

Determination of the language and medium of instruction should be a responsibility of the district/local governance structure, within the framework of the Constitution and the broad language policy framework of the provincial and national government. Locating this power at district/local level will enable regional planning which will take into account the demographic profile of a large geographic area, so that resources (human, financial and material) can be deployed more efficiently.

Capacity building for governance

Training programmes will be necessary to inform all stakeholder representatives of their powers and functions and to ensure that school officials do not restrict or inhibit others from exercising their powers and functions. The broad support expressed for such training during the interviews indicates that the GNU's proposal to provide some form of capacity building will be well received by all stakeholders as a useful contribution to their effectiveness as school governors.[28]

Role of the department in support of governing bodies

Responsibility for the implementation and success of the GNU's policy of democratic governing bodies and developing their capacity to govern rests squarely on the shoulders of the departments. The Tanzanian experience regarding the importance of ensuring the professional compentency and quality of their educational administrators must be remembered if school governing bodies are to be established and function successfully. (Karlsson; Lillis). To this end, the departments will need to establish a division for school governance, staffed with governance support officers. While training materials can be developed at national or provincial level, it is important for such structures to exist at regional/district/circuit level. These support officers should:

- Coordinate the delivery of capacity building programmes;
- Ensure the establishment of governing bodies at schools;
- Provide information and advice;
- Assist in the use of media for reporting back to constituencies;

---

[28] For more suggestions about the content of such training programmes, see Karlsson and Pampallis; Education Policy Unit.

- Act as a liaison between the governing body and the department of education;

- Ensure that accountability to stakeholders and the department (where relevant) is structured and regular;

- Act in consultation with the head of department and in accordance with departmental regulations in the event of governing body failure

Transitional issues

There are certain to be contentious matters during a time of rapid and comprehensive transformation. These must be identified and tackled.

- The constitutional functions given to provinces in Schedule 6 of the Constitution is a mix of delegated and devolved forms of decentralised power. This provides an uneasy tension with the potential to create confusion and conflict between national and provincial levels of government, their departments of education and the stakeholders represented on their governance structures.

  On one hand the Constitution appears to give (i.e. devolve) decentralised power to the provinces to legislate on schooling matters, while on the other hand provinces are only lent (delegated) power on behalf of national government which retains centralised power to legislate on matters that require regulation, e.g. through norms and standards. This balance of power may be workable among those with similar values and political objectives. However, opponents of the government will want to criticise the provinces' delegated power as being inferior and insignificant[29], while simultaneously maximising their devolved powers to legislate on educational matters which undermine the central government's attempt to establish important norms and standards in schooling.

- The traditions of schools cannot be regarded as sacrosanct and immune to the transition which is necessary for the GNU's commitment to democratise South Africa's school governance system. These traditions developed in conditions quite different to those that the new democratic state aims to create in South Africa and thus they cannot be accepted as reasons for holding back change.

- There will be attitudinal resistance to change. Those stakeholders that formerly comprised the status quo must now share power with other stakeholders in the new governing bodies. These new structures will experience teething problems. The Departments of Education should preempt these by quickly establishing support structures, appointing support staff and commencing capacity building programmes as soon as possible. Clear communications regarding the governing body will avoid confusion and provide schools with an unambiguous indication of the department's direction and leadership.

---

[29] The opposition of the National Education Policy Bill and its referral by the minority parties to the Constitutional Government in December 1995, is a perfect example of this.

- The way in which better resourced schools accommodate and provide for learners from disadvantaged backgrounds and the way in which schools with a dominant Eurocentric culture accommodate learners with different cultures and interest groups must be confronted. These important and highly emotive issues should not be left solely in the hands of the school's governing body. Clear policy and practice guidelines should be developed by provincial and district level governance structures, constituting a standard affirmative action policy for all schools.

- It will take time for the Departments of Education to formulate governance regulations, establish provincial and district/local structures which can coordinate and assist with school governance, appoint trained staff and develop materials for capacity building programmes. This delay is unavoidable and undesirable. In order for schools to begin to be governed democratically as soon as possible, it will be necessary for schools to be given incentives so that they take the initiative in establishing their own governing bodies as soon as the regulations are ready.

- The powers and functions of the present governing bodies of all types of schools must be changed if the GNU is to implement its policy of democratic school governance involving all the relevant stakeholders. For this to occur in accordance with the Constitution, *bona fide* negotiations will have to take place. The power to employ teachers, charge compulsory user fees and determine the admissions policy and practice of the school will be among the primary items in such discussions. For practical reasons and to avoid unnecessary delays in the introduction of democratic governing bodies, Model C schools will need to form a single negotiating forum (at least at provincial level). It can be anticipated that those interest groups with the most to lose from such negotiations will pressure the government to enter into negotiations with each school separately.

- For an evaluation of the rate and effectiveness of the transition to democratic, non-racist and non-sexist governance in the schooling system, departments and schools need to monitor and keep statistical records of the changes occuring in student admissions, administrative and teaching staff and elected governors. This should apply to every level of governance. Criticisms that the keeping of racial and gender statistical records is discriminatory are short-sighted and narrow. It is only possible to measure and evaluate the extent to which the schooling system is being transformed and moving in the direction of the stated objectives if such data is gathered and analysed.

- Arbitration and resolution of conflict and the allocation of responsibility for taking decisions when there is a breakdown in school governance must be defined and regulated by the Minister of Education and MECs in the provinces. The complex nature of democratic school governance, involving learners, employers, employees and the community within a statutory structure that has legal status and responsibilities, is a situation with the potential to deteriorate rapidly into a crisis unless there are clear guidelines for procedures. Such precautionary measures should not, however, be the thief of the role that these democratic governance structures have to play in developing our schools and, through consensus and consultation, peacefully building a culture of teaching and learning.

6. LIST OF WORKS CITED

African National Congress (ANC). 1994a. *Implementation plan for education and training*. Johannesburg: ANC Education Department.

African National Congress (ANC). 1994b. *Policy framework for education and training: discussion document*. Johannesburg: ANC Education Department.

African National Congress (ANC). 1994c. *Reconstruction and development programme*. Johannesburg: Umanyano Publications.

African National Congress. Constitutional Committee and the Department of Local and Regional Government and Housing. 1992. *Regional policy: discussion document*. Cape Town: Centre for Development Studies (CDS), University of the Western Cape.

Behr, A.L. 1988. *Education in South Africa: origins, issues and trends: 1652-1988*. Pretoria: Academia.

Bowe, R. and Ball, S. 1992. 'Doing what should come naturally': an exploration of LMS in one secondary school. 36-52. In Wallace, G. (ed.) *Local management of schools: research and experience*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Braslavsky, C. 1991. Education at a time of democratic transition in South America. *Prospects Quarterly Review of Education*, 21(4):597-602.

Bray, M. 1985. Education and decentralisation in less developed countries: a comment on general trends, issues and problems, with particular reference to Papua New Guinea. *Comparative Education*, 21(2):183-195.

Chaskalson, M. 1995. Constitutional implications. In Greenstein, R. et.al. (eds). *Towards a new framework for school organisation: proceedings of a conference held on 25-26 April 1995 in Durban, KwaZulu-Natal*. Durban: EPU (University of Natal) and EPU (University of the Witwatersrand).

Chinapah, V. 1991. Educational planning, administration and management in Africa. *Prospects Quarterly Review of Education*, 21(1):27-42.

Chubb, J. and Moe, T. 1992. *A lesson in school reform from Great Britain*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.

Citizen, 1 December 1992.

Cohen, C. 1994. *Administering education in Namibia: the colonial period to the present*. Windhoek: Namibia Scientific Society.

Daily Dispatch, 14 April 1992.

Davies, L. 1990. *Equity and efficiency?: school management in an international context*. London: Falmer Press.

Department of Education. 1995a. *National Education Policy Bill.* B83-95.

Department of Education. 1995b. *Report of the Committee to Review the Organisation, Governance and Funding of Schools.* Pretoria: DoE.

Department of Education. 1995c. White paper on education and training: first steps to develop a new system. *Government Gazette*, 357(16312).

Department of Education. 1995d. Draft Education White Paper on the Organisation, Governance and Funding of Schools. A draft policy document for discussion. Government Gazette. 365(16839).

Department of National Education. 1992. *Education renewal strategy: management solutions for education in South Africa.* Pretoria: DNE.

Eastern Province Herald, 13 March 1992.

Education Policy Unit (Natal). 1993. Report to the National Leadership of the NECC on the development of a Training Programme for PTSAs. (Unpublished).

Education Policy Unit (Natal). 1994. Orientation Training Course for PTSAs: A Trainer's Guide. (Unpublished).

Education Policy Unit/Macro-Education Policy Unit. 1994. *Proposals for the Restructuring of Education and Training in KwaZulu-Natal.* Durban: EPU, University of Natal.

Fuller, B. and Habte, A. 1992. Education policy adjustment: defining central strategy, assessing local effects. 1-13. In Fuller, B. and Habte, A. (eds.) 1992. *Adjusting educational policies: conserving resources while raising school quality.* (World Bank discussion papers no. 132.) Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

Fuller, B. 1992. Lessons learned?: a colorful rainbow of viewpoints. 43-47. In Fuller, B. and Habte, A. (eds.) 1992. *Adjusting educational policies: conserving resources while raising school quality.* (World Bank discussion papers no. 132.) Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

Gauteng Department of Education. 1995. Enrolment at Model C schools. (facsimile: 24 August 1995.)

Greenstein, R. et.al. (eds). 1995. *Towards a new framework for school organisation: proceedings of a conference held on 25-26 April 1995 in Durban, KwaZulu-Natal.* Durban: EPU (University of Natal) and EPU (University of the Witwatersrand).

Hanson, M. 1989. Decentralisation and regionalisation in educational administration: comparisons of Venezuela, Colombia and Spain. *Comparative Education*, 22(1):41-54.

Heads of Education KwaZulu-Natal (KZNWG). 1994a. *A unitary department of education and training: discussion document for KwaZulu-Natal*. Durban: Heads of Education.

Heads of Education KwaZulu-Natal (KZNWG). 1994b. *A unitary department of education and training: proposals for KwaZulu-Natal: supplementary reports*. Durban: Heads of Education.

Horio, T. 1986. Towards reform in Japanese education: a critique of privatisation and proposal for the re-creation of public education. *Comparative Education*, 25(1):31-36.

Jones, K. 1989. *Right turn: the conservative revolution in education*. London: Hutchinson Radius.

Karlsson, J. 1994. Decentralisation of education: international experience and its lessons for South Africa. *Education Monitor*, 5(2):1-8.

Lillis, K.M. 1990. Management of decentralisation of education in Tanzania: towards the identification of training needs. *International Review of Education*, 36(4):417-440.

Manganyi, Dr C. Opening address. Greenstein, R. et.al. (eds). 1995. *Towards a new framework for school organisation: proceedings of a conference held on 25-26 April 1995 in Durban, KwaZulu-Natal*. Durban: EPU (University of Natal) and EPU (University of the Witwatersrand).

McGinn, N. and Pereira, L. 1992. Why states change the governance of education: an historical comparison of Brazil and the United States. *Comparative Education*, 28(2):167-180.

Namibia. Ministry of Education and Culture. 1993. *Toward education for all: a development brief for education, culture, and training*. Windhoek: Gamsberg MacMillan.

Natal Education Department (NED). 1994. *Statistics and information 1994 Statistiek en inligting*. [Pietermaritzburg]: NED.

National Education Policy Investigation (NEPI). 1992. *Governance and administration: report of the NEPI Governance and Administration Research group*. Cape Town: OUP/NECC.

New Nation, 3 July 1992.

Nicholls, Gordon. 1992. Organisation and administration of education In van Dyk, B. (ed). *Proposals for education provision in a democratic South Africa*. Durban: Natal Teachers' Society.

Nzimande, B. 1991. ANC perspective on multi-cultural education: paper presented at an HSRC organised workshop titled 'Multi-cultural school admissions: problems and opportunities' held on 15 June 1991 at Edgewood College of Education, Pinetown (unpublished).

Pampallis, J. 1993. School ownership in South Africa. *Education Monitor*, 4(1): 1-8.

Pampallis, J. 1995. School organisation in South Africa: what we have inherited and what we can do about it. In Greenstein, R. et al. (eds). *Towards a new framework for school organisation: proceedings of a conference held on 25-26 April 1995 in Durban, KwaZulu-Natal*. Durban: EPU (University of Natal) and EPU (University of the Witwatersrand).

Prawda, J. 1993. Educational decentralisation in Latin America: lessons learned. *International Journal for Educational Development*, 13(3):253-264.

Singh, J.S. and Mukherjee, H. 1993. Educational and national integration in Malaysia: stocktaking thirty years after independence. *International Journal for Educational Development*, 13(2):89-102.

South African Institute of Race Relations. 1984. *Race relations survey 1984*. Johannesburg: SAIRR.

Star, 28 November 1992.

Star, 31 August 1992.

Tan, J. 1993. Independent schools in Singapore: implications for social and educational inequalities. *International Journal for Educational Development*, 13(3):239-251.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). 1993. *Human development report 1993*. New York: OUP.

United Nations. *Convention on the Rights of the Child*. United Nations General Assembly Document A/RES/44/25 (12 December 1989).

Zulu, V.T. 1993. Education in the new South Africa: an IFP perspective, an address given at Edgewood College of Education, 26 August 1993. (Unpublished).

Zulu, V.T. 1994. Address to the conference of community-based organisations, on 7 July. (Unpublished).